The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XVIII. *June, 1912.* *No. 6.*

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits, and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit, c. 6.*

PUBLISHED BY

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. H. FURST COMPANY, PRINTERS,
BALTIMORE.

The
Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. XVIII. *June, 1912.* *No. 6.*

THE PERSONALITY OF ST. CLARE.

In view of the seventh centenary of the Poor Clares which occurs this year, the history of St. Clare is being made the subject of fresh researches by students of the Franciscan Legend. Although those who venture upon this well-trodden field in the hope that therein they may unearth some new material incur considerable risk of failure, yet the discovery of any document which did but wrest a fact or two more from the past about this most elusive of the Saints would be a distinct asset. For I think all whose opinion is worth noticing will grant that if the life story of St. Clare is in some respects one of the most interesting and inspiring in medieval history it is, at the same time, one of the most perplexing.[1] Large as her figure looms in the Franciscan legend, the personality behind it remains vague and shadowy. Indeed the annals of the Order are full of other lives that, less outstanding, are yet better known to us than that of St. Clare. This however, is partly accounted for by the fact that not all the contemporary records bearing upon her life have come down to us. We can only lament the silence of history concerning these records. Without doubt some of them perished along with other early Franciscan documents as a result of the decree

[1] See Lucien Roure: "Sainte Claire d'Assise" in *Etudes* (Paris, 1910); t. CXXIV, pp. 297-316.

of the Chapter General of the Friars Minor in 1266.[2] Others disappeared during times of warfare when the monasteries of the Clares were sacked and the nuns dispersed. However this may be, Prof. Vincenzo Locatelli made a fruitless search for these missing documents more than half a century ago.[3] My own recent efforts to gain any clue to their whereabouts, if they still exist, have been equally unsuccessful.[4]

In default of additional material being brought to light it is impracticable to give anything more than a general sketch of the life of St. Clare. All the information we have about her derives from three principal sources, namely:—I. The Saint's own writings. II. Some Pontifical documents bearing upon her life. III. A contemporary Legend or biography written soon after her death.[5] Unhappily we are far from possessing anything like all the writings of St. Clare. Only very few of her letters have escaped the ravages of time; only five in fact. While no one would venture to hold up these letters as models of classical Latinity, yet they witness to the readiness with which the Saint wrote and, what is more important, they bear the impress of her rare personality. They possess, therefore, an interest above the purely historical—the

[2] The text of the Decree in question is as follows: "Praecipit Generale Capitulum per obedientiam quod omnes legendae de beato Francisco olim factae deleantur et, ubi inveniri poterunt extra ordinem, ipsas fratres studeant amovere," etc. See Ehrle: "Die ältesten Redactionen der Generalconstitutionen des Franziskanerordens" in *Archiv. für Litt. und Kirchengeschichte* (1892), p. 39; also Little: "Decrees of the Chapters General of the Friars Minor 1260-1282" in *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, t. XIII, pp. 704-8. On the effect of this edict see Van Ortroy, in *Anal. Boll.*, t. XVIII, p. 174; Lemmens, *Doc. Ant. Franciscana*, pars II, p. 11; Ed. d'Alençon in *Etudes Franciscaines*, t. I, p. 656; and Faloci in *Misc. Franc.*, t. VII, p. 159.

[3] Cf. Locatelli: *Vita di S. Chiara* (Assisi, 1854), p. 131.

[4] Cf. *Arch. Franc. Hist.*, t. I (1908), pp. 413-432, and my "Life of St. Clare" (1910), pp. xvi-xx.

[5] In addition to these Sources, properly so called, there is a certain number of later works of secondary importance referring to the life of St. Clare. The writers of these works borrowed freely from the earlier ones, making additions or omissions at pleasure. The fact that they sometimes had access to original documents which have not come down to us gives their work a value it would not otherwise possess, but they do not add anything essential to the main lines of the story of St. Clare.

interest called human.[6] The same is true to a certain extent of the Testament ascribed to St. Clare and which is in some sort the complement of her letters. This document is historically so important that I lately attempted to open up the question of its authenticity.[7] The views I ventured to express on this subject have called forth not a little comment, and the point to which most of this comment has been directed is that I sought to defend on intrinsic grounds the authenticity of the Testament ascribed to St. Clare. It is quite impossible here to enter at any length into the question of the genuineness of this document since the points at issue are too technical for concise treatment. I shall therefore content myself by remarking that, owing to the obscurity which surrounds the earliest text of the Testament we possess, it is very difficult to adduce any extrinsic arguments in its favor. Indeed, the main reason why its authenticity has been questioned is that it did not become generally known until the middle of the sixteenth century.[8] But it may well be the case, as a recent writer remarks, that the late appearance of the Testament of St. Clare is due to the fact "that the majority of the Clares were Urbanists living under dispensations from the Rule of Most High Poverty, and that many Clares even of the Strict Observance were under the guidance of Conventuals to whom the doctrine was decidedly unacceptable."[9] Herein perhaps is matter for further enquiry. Meanwhile I am happy to note that the eminent Bollandist Fr. Van Ortroy, who not so very long ago was decidedly sceptical about the authenticity of this

[6] The text of St. Clare's letters to Princess Agnes of Bohemia is given by the Bollandists, *ASS. Martii* I, pp. 505-507. Unfortunately the originals do not appear to have survived; at all events nothing is known of their whereabouts.

[7] See "The Writings of St. Clare," in *Arch. Francis. Hist.* III (1910), pp. 442-447.

[8] The text seems to have first appeared in the Chronicle of Mark of Lisbon (1556-1562), from which it was put into Latin by Wadding. Both give the same vague source. Cf. Lisbona-Diola, *Croniche degli Ordini di S. Francesco* (Venice, 1585), lib. VIII, p. 213, and Wadding: *Annales* ad an. 1253, n. 5.

[9] Cf. *Saturday Review*, London, July 23, 1910, p. 117.

Testament,[10] has so far modified his views as to endorse the conclusions in favor of it lately advanced by the present writer.[11]

Besides the writings of St. Clare there are, as we have seen, a certain number of early Bulls bearing upon her life which form the second source of her history. Although these Papal documents are all characterized by the same grayness and lack of literary excitement, yet they throw illuminating side lights upon the origin and evolution of the Rule of the Poor Ladies.[12] But save for the witness they bear to St. Clare's life-long struggle for the "privilege" of Most High Poverty, they tell us nothing directly of Clare the woman. Nor does the contemporary Legend which forms the third source of her history give anything like an adequate presentation of her personality.[13] There is about it a want of visualization which brings a feeling of disappointment; we might reasonably have expected much more in view of the sources of information then within reach. Happily we are not now called upon to determine the question of the authorship of this Legend, but the modern attribution of it to Thomas of Celano is probably correct, though it cannot yet be scientifically proved as Goetz wisely reminds us.[14] Perhaps it is well to recall that Papini, after concluding in 1822 for the Celanensian authorship of the Legend,[15] afterwards retracted this opinion.[16] M. Sabatier,

[10] See *Analecta Bollandiana*, t. XXII, p. 360.

[11] *Ibid.*, t. XXX, p. 490-491.

[12] They are given by Sbaralea: *Bull. Fran.* I and II *passim* and form the basis of an article on the Rule of St. Clare by the present writer in the *Ecclesiastical Review*, April, 1912, p. 398-414.

[13] This Legend has recently been edited by Prof. Pennacchi. Cf. *Legenda S. Clarae Virginis* tratta dal MSS. 338 della Bibl. Communale de Assisi; Tip. Metastasio, 1910. There is an English translation by the present writer made from the same codex—"The Life of St. Clare" (Philadelphia, 1910).

[14] Cf. *Die Quellen, etc.* (Gotha, 1904), pp. 240-243. Jörgensen tells us—on what authority, it is impossible to discover—that the Legend of S. Clare was written by Messer Bartholomew, Bishop of Spoleto, in collaboration with Brother Leo and Brother Angelo of Rieti, and revised by Thomas of Celano. See his "S. Francis of Assisi," translated by T. O'Conor Sloane (Longmans, 1912), p. 123.

[15] *Notizie Sicure*, etc. (Ed. Florence, 1822), p. 137.

[16] *Storia di S. Francesco* (Foligno, 1827), lib. II, p. 236.

who favors the claims of Thomas of Celano, on the strength of Papini's earlier opinion,[17] has apparently quite overlooked the subsequent retraction of the great Conventual critic; nor is there any Latin codex in the Laurenziana Library of the kind the French writer mentions. As for the Magliabecchian MS. of which the Prologue, published by Cozza-Luzi,[18] ascribes our Legend to Thomas of Celano, this codex is, in all likelihood, the work of a seventeenth century scribe, as I have elsewhere shown.[19]

But even if Thomas of Celano wrote this Legend of St. Clare —a point not yet satisfactorily cleared up—its lack of symmetry and patchwork character go to show that it is a composite work. The compiler found various accounts to hand and these he put together, worked over and welded into one. This fact is borne in upon the observant reader by the feeling that he cannot find the St. Clare he meets in one page moving about in the events described in another. And further the figure of the real St. Clare of which we get a glimpse in some incidents is completely lost sight of throughout whole chapters amid the conventional commonplaces of mediæval hagiography. For, in common with most of the hagiographical records of the Middle Ages, the present Legend is strangely silent about what might be termed the personal side of the Saint's life. Very few facts of merely biographical interest light up its pages; the exquisitely human and instinctive side of St. Clare's character is almost overlooked—as if St. Clare was not a woman as well as a Saint; the more a Saint because so much a woman.

Taken as a whole then, the limited number of documents at our disposal for the life of St. Clare are not intimate enough to make her live as St. Francis lives in the pages of his biographers. At best they are scrappy with long silences and deep *lacunae*. To realize this let anyone try to trace even the main lines in the history of St. Clare from the cradle to the grave by the light of these documents, and it will soon

[17] *Spec. Perf.*, p. lxxv.
[18] *Chiara di Assisi secondo alcune nuove scoperte*, ecc. (Rome, 1895).
[19] *Arch. Francis. Hist.* III (1910), p. 447.

appear how unilluminating they are about many points on which we most need enlightenment. At the outset we are met with the difficulty that no information is available as to the parents of St. Clare. Her contemporary biographer was so far preoccupied with the splendor that radiated from her sanctity that he did not concern himself about her family. According to the account generally given, Clare was a daughter of Count Favorino Scifi, an Assisian noble. We are not able to verify this by documents. It would, however, be very short-sighted for that reason alone to dismiss such a tradition as of no historical value, although it must be admitted that the exaggerations of later biographers of the Saint based upon it deserve to awaken suspicion. Beyond doubt Clare was of noble lineage,[20] but the most ardent out-and-out defender of local traditions will probably admit that no great reliance can be placed upon the elaborate pedigree of St. Clare furnished by Père de Chérancé [21] and others. Again it is impossible to discover the exact date of the Saint's birth; the year 1194, which is usually fixed on, is guesswork but good guesswork and probably correct. We cannot help feeling that the marvels which are recorded to have attended Clare's birth are leading up, however remotely, to her canonization. Certain it is that she was suckled on piety by her saintly mother Hortulana, and that the precocious child assimilated not a little of the atmosphere of religion in which she was brought up. It is a pretty picture, that of the tiny maid counting out her childish prayers by means of a heap of pebbles and depriving herself of delicacies that she might send them out secretly to the orphans. Naturally a child like that would grow up into something unusual. And so she did. Her father wished to make a fine match for his daughter, but her meeting with St. Francis changed the outlook of her life and turned it to a serious and set purpose. And the change gave fixity to her natural enthusiasm and courage. Had events not thrown her in relation with the *Poverello,* Clare

[20] See *Chron.* XXIV *Gen.* in *Anal. Fran.* III, p. 48: "Frater Rufinus Cipii . . . . de nobilioribus civibus Assisi, consanguineus S. Clarae, etc."

[21] *Sainte Claire d'Assise* (Paris, 1902), p. 9.

would not have become an historical character. As it is, the main thread of her life begins with that meeting, which took place during the Lent of 1212 when she was about eighteen. From that time forth her story, in so far as we are able to reconstruct it, takes on not a little the character of romance. A romance it was in a way from the day she first heard St. Francis preach, through varying scenes until forty-one years later she was laid to rest in the very chapel where his sermons had brought about her "conversion." Perhaps the picture that will live longest in the memory of those who have followed St. Clare's life through those four decades will be that of the young girl's midnight flight from her father's house to an unknown future—which was destined to result in the foundation of the Poor Clares. There is nothing else quite like it in the Lives of the Saints.

Clare seemed at once to spring into spiritual maturity. By far the most attractive pages in her Legend are those in which we read of the beginnings of her religious life. For in the events of St. Clare's life up to her installation at S. Damiano, we feel more or less in touch with the woman. Later she seems to die slowly out of the pages of her contemporary biographer in the hands of its author. This is owing, perhaps, to the fact that to outward seeming her life was similar to that led by the other nuns at S. Damiano and that it presented few striking features to the eye of the world. Once only is she said to have quitted her monastery and that was to eat with St. Francis and his companions at the Porziuncola, when the two Saints were so rapt in things divine that an unearthly light shone round the little company at their untasted repast. Because I ventured to express the opinion that the charming chapter in the *Actus-Fioretti* [22] which records this incident was wholly devoid of historical foundation,[23] I have laid myself open to attack from various quarters. "Father Paschal Robinson goes too far," says Professor Little, "in declaring the

[22] Cf. *Actus XV Fioretti XIV;* also *Liber Conformit.* (Ed. Quaracchi), *Anal. Fran.* IV, p. 353.

[23] Cf. Robinson: *Life of St. Clare* (1910), p. 127.

Portiuncula story . . . . wholly devoid of historical foundation." [24] Be it so. I do not mean to argue the point now; I hope to return to it before long in another place and at some length. Meanwhile the anonymous editor of a recent volume entitled "St. Clare and Her Order" has remarked something to the effect, if I mistake not, that I have been more cautious than courageous in rejecting this incident, and implies that I was led to do so because it involves a breach of the *clausura* at S. Damiano.[25] In answer to this criticism it must suffice to say that, far from being worried by any fear of such a breach, the existence of the law of enclosure never even occurred to me in this connection, for the simple reason that my own researches in this matter, whatever they may be worth, have convinced me that it is well-nigh impossible to say whether or not definitive enclosure had yet been imposed upon the Clares at the time the repast at the Porziuncola is supposed to have taken place. An adequate conception of the difficulties surrounding the whole question can only be had from a careful study of the original documents bearing upon it. Might I venture to add that the study of these documents is much to be recommended as a corrective to limited views and one-sided enthusiasm. So far as concerns the incident narrated in the *Fioretti,* it is entirely true to the Franciscan Spirit and is redolent of the true *Umbria Mystica,* as I have elsewhere insisted.[26] It is far otherwise, however, with the so-called "legend of the roses" which the editor of "St. Clare and Her Order" has borrowed from Mrs. De Selincourt's "Homes of the First Franciscans." [27] With this sort of sentimental nonsense we have no truce.

But to return to what more immediately concerns our present purpose, St. Clare appears on the scene in another chapter of the *Fioretti,* where we find her counselling St. Francis to con-

[24] *English Historical Review,* No. C (October, 1910), p. 766.

[25] See *St. Clare and Her Order,* edited by the author of "The Enclosed Nun." (London: Mills and Boon Ltd., 1912), p. 22 ff.

[26] In the article on "St. Clare" in *Franciscan Essays* (1912), p. 38.

[27] *Op. cit.,* pp. 23-24.

tinue his mission to the people rather than to devote himself to a life of contemplation.[28] We get fortunately some other few glimpses of her in some of the early documents concerning St. Francis. Thus for instance, the *Speculum Perfectionis* tells us how Clare built a little hut of reeds in the garden at S. Damiano for St. Francis during his last visit there,[29] and Thomas of Celano describes her grief over the dead body of the *Poverello*.[30] But after rare glimpses such as these the figure of St. Clare drops entirely out of view, only to emerge into beauty and vitality in 1228 when Gregory IX came to Assisi for the canonization of St. Francis. The venerable Pontiff visited S. Damiano and pressed St. Clare to make some provision for the unforeseen wants of her community. "If it be thy vow that hindreth thee," said the Pope, "we dispense thee from it." "Holy Father," was Clare's reply, "absolve me from my sins if thou wilt, but I desire not to be absolved from following Christ forever." This interview discloses the moral strength and earnestness of the woman which underlay all she did and which gave her a striking personality and character of her own.

The Saint's contemporary biographer has put on record another incident which also goes to show that she was the most independent yet most submissive of women. It seems that Gregory IX forbade any of the friars to visit the monasteries of the Clares or preach there without his permission, whereupon St. Clare at once sent away even the brother questors who provided bodily sustenance for her community, saying: "He might as well take all the friars from us now that he has taken those who furnished us with the food of the soul."

We see, too, in Clare's repulse of the Saracen archers of Frederick II. who had sought to force an entry into S. Damiano, what mettle her heart was made of. In her conduct on that occasion there was the quiet heroism, quite devoid of any

[28] Cf. *Fioretti* XV; also Bonaventure, *Legenda Major* (Ed. Quaracchi), XII, 2.

[29] *Spec. Perf.* (Ed. Sabatier), p. XXXV.

[30] II Celano, II (Ed. d'Alençon), 10.

feminine fussiness, which imposes itself upon men and women alike and creates an atmosphere. Nor was that the first time Clare had faced armed men without flinching and had routed them. Of weak health, always in pain, she lived upon her spirit, the courage of which was indestructible. Witness her long struggle under every possible disadvantage for the "Privilege" of Most High Poverty. The story of that struggle is a revelation in character as beautiful as it is pathetic. But we may not dwell upon it now. Enough to recall how the gentle Abbess, who "out of weakness was made strong," held steadfastly to her way, unwearied and fearless, never swerving from the path St. Francis had marked out for her. The sense that she was called on to uphold his ideals gave to her character an indomitableness, a calm determination, a still enthusiasm, a sheer defiance of all hindrances that never left her to the end. And in the end she got all she wanted because she would not take a nay, and because before getting or giving anything she gave first and wholly herself.

It has been said that only a man could have understood and appreciated Clare and, for this reason, that from some points of view she may be said to have had a man's heart in a woman's breast. Be this as it may, other aspects of her life show that the man's heart in the woman's breast had something also of the woman's heart about it. Her letters to the Princess Agnes of Bohemia and what we know of her relations with the community of S. Damiano strengthened this view of her, for in them she is revealed as the most affectionate of friends and the tenderest of guides. It was not a life of visionary or speculative meditation that she taught her nuns to pursue, but one of activity and operative occupation. She herself set the example and even in her last illness had herself propped up in bed so that she might be able to keep on spinning fine altar linen for the poor churches of the Umbrian countryside. Assuredly then Clare merits a high place among the heroines of suffering and of service. In the best sense of the word she was a valiant woman. That all through. No characteristic is more strikingly marked in her life than her fortitude; even

on her death bed she strengthened in the service of Christ all who came to her. For one and all she had a word of encouragement. Thus, once when Cardinal Rainaldo was exhorting her to patience during an access of suffering, Clare said: "Believe me, dearest brother, that ever since the day I received the grace of vocation from our Lord through his servant Francis, no suffering hath troubled me, no penance been too hard, no infirmity too great." Up to the end she clung with pathetic devotion to the memory of St. Francis which had scored itself indelibly on the tablets of her very soul.

Something of the old charm, which is singularly absent in other chapters, comes back in the closing pages of Clare's contemporary Legend, which tell us of the presence at her deathbed of Leo, Angelo and Juniper, three of the favorite early companions of the *Poverello*. Only one who was present could have furnished the intimate details recorded of Clare's last days. It may easily be that we owe them to Leo, who was a lifelong friend of Clare, and who was said to have collaborated to some extent in writing her life. Had Leo's writings come down to us in their entirety, they might furnish materials for a more complete picture of St. Clare than we now possess. As it is, only a partial view of her is obtained. It is needless to say that any biographies of the Saint which seek to supply what is wanting by drawing on late sources of doubtful origin only serve to increase the obscurity which hangs over so much of the life of St. Clare.

It seems desirable in conclusion to add a word as to the personal appearance of St. Clare. What manner of woman was she to look upon? In connection with this question a writer in the *Athenæum* apropos of Miss Gurney Salter's admirable volume: "Franciscan Legends in Italian Art," has this to say: "In discussing St. Clare and giving pictures of her in youth and age, the writer does not seem to allude to the fact that we have an unquestionable check upon them as her body is intact and the shape of her face absolutely preserved." [31] Unfortunately for this assertion the facts do not

[31] *Athenæum*, No. 4090 (March 17, 1906), p. 335.

bear it out. For it will hardly be pretended by anyone who has had an opportunity to venerate the mortal remains of St. Clare, that "her body is intact and the shape of her face absolutely preserved." [32] In point of fact the mummy-like skeleton of the Saint enshrined in the crypt of S. Chiara at Assisi affords us only the very haziest idea of what St. Clare looked like in the days of her flesh. Assuredly it has nothing or next to nothing in common with the pen picture of St. Clare which an early chronicler has left us. "Her face was oval," he says, "her forehead spacious, her complexion brilliant and hair very fair. A celestial smile played in her eyes and around her mouth; her nose was well proportioned and slightly aquiline; of good stature, she was rather inclined to stoutness but not to excess."

We may take it for granted I suppose that St. Clare was never painted in her lifetime. The oldest known picture of her extant is preserved at S. Chiara at Assisi, and hangs in the Chapel dedicated to Clare's younger sister St. Agnes. According to its own inscription this picture dates from 1283, that is about thirty years after the death of St. Clare. It is a full-length figure painted on wood and is mainly in two colors—red and black. Tradition tells us that it is the work of Cimabue. However that may be, the original painting has been retouched not a little and seems somewhat stiff and expressionless.[33] Although the picture is in no way remarkable for beauty yet it has the appearance of being a faithful record;

[32] See *Cath. Ency.* IV, 6, St. Clare. And here are the words of one who was present when the Saint's coffin was opened in 1850. "To our pious disappointment, the sweet virgin Saint was not found entire. The skull was perfect, but lay at one side, as if the coffin had been too short, and detached from the bones of the neck. The chest had fallen in and I could not discover many rib bones. On her breast was a laurel branch and a crown of flowers." From a letter of Canon Chadwick of Ushaw to the Poor Clares at Scorton (Eng.), quoted in *The Princess of Poverty* (1900), p. 197.

[33] See *Franciscan Legends in Italian Art* (1905), p. 191. It is a matter of regret that Miss Salter has told us so little about the early pictures of St. Clare. Indeed the monograph of the Saint has never received any but the most cursory treatment.

it is clearly an attempt at individual portraiture—no mere stereotype of a conventional saint. Even if it does not embody the actual features of St. Clare, this ancient picture is the only painting known to us which can lay any claim to be considered a portrait. In it the Saint is portrayed as a tall, middle-aged woman with a thin, worn face; she wears a heavy brown habit and mantle with a black veil, her waist is girt with a thick cord, her feet are bare and she holds a four fold cross in her left hand. The figure of St. Clare is enhanced by a series of small scenes from her Legend painted on either side. Commencing with the lowest panel on the left side they are as follows: (1) St. Clare receives the palm branch from the Bishop of Assisi on Palm Sunday 1212; (2) St. Francis and the friars at the Porziuncola advance to meet her on the night of her flight from her father's house; (3) St. Francis cuts off her hair before the altar; (4) her parents seek to force her to return home. Then, beginning with the highest one on the right side, they continue thus: (5) St. Clare is joined by her sister Agnes; (6) she blesses some loaves at the command of the Pope; (7) death of the Saint; (8) translation of her remains from San Damiano to San Giorgio in Assisi.

It may be well that this ancient picture of St. Clare is an *immagine commemorativa,* painted perhaps from memory under the direction of those who had known her during her lifetime. In any event it is of the utmost value as showing the concept of her formed by a contemporary or almost contemporary painter. And if the likeness was satisfactory to Clare's contemporaries it ought surely to be so to anybody else; still it must be owned that it falls sadly short of our idea of Clare and seems most unsatisfying beside the more charming concepts of later painters of the Sienese and Umbrian schools. But that is another question which, be it ever so interesting, may not be dwelt on here.

Fr. Paschal Robinson, O. F. M.

ST. THOMAS OF AQUIN.

Scholastic philosophy is the effort of human reason to think out the truths of nature in conformity with the truth which Revelation has put within our reach. Let us deal, for a moment, with fundamentals, so that later on finer and more subtle matters of definition may be more intelligible. Christians from the beginning were convinced that both in the Old Testament and in the New Dispensation, God has taught mankind various truths which are to be believed on His authority. This body of truth is called revelation, or revealed truth. It is contained in the Bible; for Catholics, it is contained also in the authoritative teaching of the Church in matters of Faith and morals. Besides truth of this kind, there is truth which the human mind itself discovers, the truths of science and of philosophy, in a word, natural truth. These two kinds of truth are the terms of an age-long problem, and it is important to understand them clearly: on the one side revealed truth, revelation, faith, theology; on the other, science, reason, philosophy. Many solutions of the problem are possible and every possible solution has been tried at one time or another.

First, it is possible to deny one term of the problem, and assert that there is no revealed truth, that there is no revelation, that all truth is the truth of reason, that so-called divine truth is man-made and man-given. This is Rationalism, and it was, in effect, adopted by the early Gnostic heretics, who put their own philosophy above the authority of the Church and of the Gospels, though they claimed that that philosophy had come to them by secret transmission as the hidden doctrine of Christ. That is the solution (if solution it may be called, for it really evades the problem as stated) of theological skepticism in every age.

Secondly, it is possible, in practice, at least, to deny the other term of the problem, and say that only revealed truth avails,

that it is enough for any Christian to *believe,* that reasoning will not save his soul, that it will more probably lead him away from God and spiritual truth. This is obscurantist mysticism of the extreme type, and one may doubt whether any sane Christian ever held it, though extravagant statements are to be found which would, literally, bear that interpretation.

Thirdly, most popular of all solutions and most common, I think, among modern philosophers, is to keep the two kinds of truth entirely apart. "Keep your theology out of your philosophy" is the advice we constantly receive. Believe what your Church teaches you, take the Bible, or the lessons of the Sunday-School, or the doctrine that is preached to you from the pulpit, and if you act up to that belief, you are a consistent Christian. But when you study science and philosophy, do so without any regard to what you believe. This policy, if one may so style it, was formulated in medieval times by the Arabian philosophers who justified their attitude towards the Korân and towards philosophy by the principle that "What is true in philosophy may be false in theology, and vice versa."

A fourth solution is that the two kinds of truth must agree, that there cannot be any contradiction between Faith and Reason, between revealed truth and natural truth. This conviction was in the minds of the earliest Christian thinkers. To justify it in regard to pagan philosophy, the only philosophy they knew of, they had recourse to a theory which was ingenious. They said that the same Wisdom of God which had inspired the Scriptures in a supernatural way had inspired the pagan philosophers, especially Plato, in a natural way, so that, in the designs of Providence Plato was a precursor of Christ in things natural, as John the Baptist was in things spiritual. The same thought recommended itself to St. Augustine. But, after him that peculiar phase of the principle disappeared, though the principle itself remained: that reason and revelation must agree. It was out of this that Scholasticism sprang. Scholasticism, then, was inspired in all its efforts by the one purpose, to show the accord that exists between the two orders of truth, between Faith and Reason.

The circumstances amid which Scholasticism arose further determined its understanding of this purpose. The ninth and tenth centuries were busy with the task of arranging and classifying the heritage of the past. They did this by means of logic, or dialectic. That was the only portion of philosophy to which they gave any attention. When, therefore, the eleventh and the following centuries took up the task of showing the harmony of faith and reason they used the means at hand, the dialectic which had been developed in the schools. To show by dialectical reasoning the agreement of natural with supernatural truth was then the programme, so to speak, of the Scholastics. Besides, events which it would too long to describe here, had put Aristotle in the place of Plato, and the character of the times was such that Aristotle responded to their intellectual needs better than Plato would have done. Another trait, therefore, of later Scholasticism, is the adoption of the Aristotelian point of view, an adoption which was almost universal and almost entirely exclusive of the Platonic view.

Of the philosophers whom we have studied so far, Gerbert was a conservator of the past, a teacher content with putting order and meaning into what the past had bequeathed. John the Scot, St. Anselm and Abelard mark different stages in the progress of the Scholastic idea. St. Thomas of Aquin comes at a time when that idea is fully developed, and to him is due the final formulation of it in adequate terminology.

John the Scot taught that theology and philosophy agree to the extent of being one and the same science. He saw no distinction between them; because all true knowledge, even in philosophy, is a matter of divine illumination. We speak of genius as "God-given": he considered that all knowledge is from God, and that without the Light that God sheds on the mind, man would grope in eternal darkness, incapable of seeing anything. Thus John the Scot may be said to have elevated philosophy to the rank of theology.

Abelard did the very opposite of this. He identified the two sciences, but in the opposite direction, by, apparently, at least, bringing theology down to the level of philosophy. He seemed

to acknowledge no truth that reason could not prove, and he placed no limits to the application of dialectic to the highest spiritual truths. On this account he was reprimanded and censured in his own day, although it was the same method, kept within the bounds of moderation, that afterwards was approved.

St. Anselm took the orthodox medieval view of the relation between Faith and reason. But, his understanding of the task of philosophy was partial. Moreover, he failed to give formal, technical expression to his principles of method. One may say of him that he was right as far as he went, but he did not go far enough. What is more important, one may say that, while he took up the weapons of reason in order to fight the battles of Faith, he did not formulate the rules of the contest or determine how far the use of reason was legitimate. Hence, he lived to see the struggle between the dialecticians, who set no bounds to the use of logic, and the mystics, who condemned the use of logic in matters of Faith. For mysticism was a reaction, an inevitable revulsion of Christian feeling, against the recklessness of the rationalists.

St. Thomas came after all these. Of John the Scot he knew nothing, so far as we can now determine. Of Abelard personally he knew very little, but with the method used by Abelard he was quite familiar, and he knew its limitations. He was well read in the mystics, but he realized also that they, like all controversialists, exaggerated. He knew of St. Anselm's argument and of his theory of atonement. But he conceived the task of philosophy in a broader spirit than Anselm did, and laid down very clearly, very definitely and in technical language, which the Christian Church has accepted as final, the principles of method which St. Anselm understood only partially and did not formulate in technical language at all.

Let us then, as briefly as may be, outline this central doctrine of Scholasticism as formulated by St. Thomas. His first principle is that philosophy and theology are distinct sciences. There are, indeed, truths such as the mysteries of Faith, which

belong to theology alone, with which philosophy has nothing to do. There are truths which belong to philosophy alone, such as the rotundity of the earth or the number of material elements, and with these theology does not concern itself. And there are truths which belong to both sciences, such as the existence of God or the immortality of the soul. But, although in regard to this third class of truths the two sciences overlap and share to some extent the same territory, they are always and everywhere distinct, because theology studies truth from the point of view of revelation, and philosophy studies it from the point of view of rational evidence: theology uses the scriptures as authority, philosophy relies on reason alone. This is the first principle, the distinction between Faith and Reason, between revelation and science, between theology and philosophy. It is important to understand it before we go farther. St. Thomas does not identify the two: he does not obliterate the lines which separate them. He does not bring philosophy up to the level of theology, as John the Scot did. Nor does he bring theology down to the level of philosophy, as Abelard did. Each, he says, has its own method, its own source of proof, its own point of view. In philosophy St. Thomas will not use arguments from scripture or from ecclesiastical decisions; when he is discussing the immortality of the soul in philosophy he proceeds as if there were no revelation, as if the Scriptures and the Councils of the Church and the decrees of the Popes did not exist; he argues as Plato or Aristotle would argue, resting all his reasons on the natural evidence for immortality. If, in theology, he renders to God the things that are God's, in philosophy, he renders to reason the things that are reason's. He is not, it need hardly be said, a freethinker. Yet, in philosophy he advocates freedom of discussion and excludes the compulsion of authority. The two sciences are distinct.

The second principle is that they are in complete and perfect harmony with each other. God, says St. Thomas, is the author of all truth, natural as well as supernatural. Not only has He given us a supernatural message in the Bible; He has also given us the Book of Nature, and when we turn over its pages

it is He Who is our Teacher. He put the truth there, He gave us the mind that reads the truth, He illumines the mind so that we may understand. Therefore, all truth is the truth of God. It is impossible that He should contradict Himself. There can, therefore, be no contradiction between truth of the natural order and supernatural truth, between Reason and Faith.

In one sentence, then, we may sum up the first two principles: Revelation and Reason *are distinct, yet not discordant.* There follow now two other principles bearing directly on the question of method. First, Faith aids Reason. As the mystics and St. Augustine said, *Credo ut intelligam.* Faith opens up to us a new world, the supernatural world, which is like the intelligible world of Plato, except that that was a dream, whereas this is a reality. It is a strange world into which Faith introduces us; there are many things in it which we cannot comprehend. And yet it is a logical world, for in it an Intelligent Ruler reigns and the laws of logic apply there as well as elsewhere. Faith thus broadens the horizon of our knowledge, gives new material for thought, throws open new pastures for the mind to feed on, gives larger play to our reasoning faculty, and in this way helps us to understand natural truth. For, if the mind is improved by exercise, if, as we say, it grows by what it feeds on, then the man who believes has a richer, a fuller, a better disciplined and a more resourceful mind to bring to the problems of science than the unbeliever has. Far from cramping or hindering the activity of the human reason, Faith stimulates and strengthens it. Newman has this thought in mind when he says that Faith is "seeing things as God sees them."

The second principle of method is that Reason aids Faith. It aids it in many ways. It proves the credentials of authority on which Faith rests, it answers the objections of unbelievers, removes the apparent contradictions in revealed truth and furnishes analogies and illustrations which make assent easier.

I have taken pains to detail these points of method in the teaching of St. Thomas because I consider that here we have

the heart of scholasticism, and because I believe that the clear formulation of these principles is St. Thomas' greatest achievement. In these principles he crystallized a thought that lay in solution in every Christian philosophy before his time, and in doing that he made clear once for all the truth and the error both of rationalism and of mysticism. Rationalism was right in advocating the use of reason, because reason aids the understanding of spiritual truth, even of supernatural truth; but rationalism erred in setting no limits to the use of reason. Mysticism was right in proclaiming that Faith aids Reason, that he who believes will be better able to understand; but it erred in condemning the use of reason, as if that use were a profanation of spiritual truth or a denial of the authority of God. "Faith is reasonable and reason itself is divine"—these are not the words of St. Thomas, but they express his thought with admirable succinctness. "Faith is reasonable"; therefore it is allowed to apply dialectic to matters of Faith. "Reason is divine," therefore the truth that is above us is part of our spiritual inheritance by Grace, as truth that is around us is our inheritance by nature.

All this sets the medieval Christian attitude in a clear light. But it would be a mistake to imagine that it all belongs to the department of apologetics, and interests only the controversialist on one side or the other. It is of eternal human interest, this attempt to bring unity and harmony into the aspirations of the human spirit. As a recent writer says: "The scholastics were men and so are we. Our humanity is one with theirs. Men are still under the necessity of reflecting upon their own existence and the world without, and still feel the need to reach conclusions and the impulse to formulate consistently what seem to them vital propositions. Herein we are blood kin to Gerbert and Anselm, to Abelard and Hugo of St. Victor, to Thomas Aquinas as well as to Roger Bacon: and our highest nature is one with theirs in the intellectual fellowship of human endeavor to think and present that which shall appease the mind. Because of this kinship with the scholastics, and the sympathy which we feel for the struggle which is the same in

us and in them, their intellectual endeavors, their achieved conclusions, although now appearing as but apt or necessitated phrases, may have for us the immortal interest of the eternal human." [1] What is of permanent human interest in the principles of method that have just been described is that they represent an attempt of the human mind to achieve harmony and construct a synthesis for which our nature craves. The greatest achievement of the Greeks was their synthetic effort to harmonize matter and spirit, or body and soul. The problem for the scholastics was the same, except that instead of matter and spirit they had to deal with the natural and the supernatural, instead of body and soul, they had as terms of the problem Reason and Faith. That is why St. Thomas was no mere apologist for the Catholic Faith, but a philosopher who claims rank among the very greatest.

There is one more point of method to which I beg to direct your attention for a moment. Everyone knows that the scholastics are accused of undue subservience to authority, and nothing is more frequently met with in histories of philosophy than the assertion that there was no true philosophy in medieval times, because everything was decided by the authority of the teaching Church. It is admitted freely and even gladly that the " first general quality of medieval philosophy " was " deference to authority." The ninth and tenth centuries deferred to the authority of antiquity. The twelfth and thirteenth century deferred to the authority of the Church, and the thirteenth especially to the authority of Aristotle. But, deference to authority is one thing and undue subservience is another. It was not a scholastic but a mystical opponent of scholasticism who styled philosophy " the handmaid of theology," and when the scholastics accepted the designation they explained that it should be understood in no unworthy sense. For philosophy has for its task, not to walk behind theology as a trainbearer or a menial servant, but to go before theology and perform the honorable service of bearing the torch to light theology's foot-

[1] Taylor, *The Medieval Mind*, II, 285.

steps. There were mystics in medieval times who condemned the use of reason. The scholastics, on the contrary, advocated the use of reason, and, far from being unduly subservient to authority, were more in danger of going too far in the advocacy of reason. It should never be forgotten that, while Scholasticism sprang from many tendencies, it was influenced more by rationalism than by mysticism. The justification of all its tremendous activity—for it was tremendous, witness the quantity of its literary output, no matter what we may think of the quality—was the need of exercising the rational faculty. It is a singular instance of historical injustice to accuse the scholastics of subjecting their reason to authority when, in fact, they tried to turn everything, so to speak, into grist for the logical mill of the mind.

Amor che nella mente mi ragiona,

sang Dante at the end of the thirteenth century. Love itself, every spiritual emotion, every sentiment, every experience, every interest, was grasped on its rational side and subjected to the discipline of dialectic. If the critic, instead of saying that the schoolmen did not *think,* said that they *thought too much,* there would be at least a shadow of justice in the accusation.

What has been said of the scholastics in general has reference in a particular way to St. Thomas of Aquin, who, "all-balancing, all-considering," sums up what his predecessors taught, gives it definite expression and orderly arrangement, and fixes for the rest of the Middle Ages the method, and largely the content, of philosophy.

Thomas of Aquin was by genius an Italian with all the Latin love of order and clearness of arrangement. He was, by race, of mingled Suabian and Norman blood, with all the German appreciation of thoroughness and all the Norman spirit of enterprise and originality. He was born at Aquino, not far from Monte Cassino, probably in the year 1225. His life was an uneventful one, unless we judge it from the point of view of intellectual activity and spiritual experience. At Monte

Cassino, while he was yet a child, at Naples and later on at Cologne and Paris, he was a diligent and retentive student. His entry into the Order of St. Dominic when he was in his eighteenth year not only determined his religious vocation in opposition to the wishes of his family, but also influenced his intellectual career in the most decisive manner. It brought him into contact with the most renowned Aristotelian teacher of that age, Albert the Great. It also threw him, contrary, we think, to his own inclination and tastes, into the most violent controversy in the Academic world of that age, at the University of Paris. The young University was working out its rights and its obligations in circumstances of unusual confusion and turmoil. The so-called "seculars" were defending what they considered to be University privilege against the newly established "regulars," or members of the mendicant orders, who were accused of upsetting the traditions of the University. It is not necessary to enter, here, into the merits of the dispute, nor into a detailed description of the unseemly conflicts to which it led. It is sufficient to call attention to the fact that, though Thomas was an ardent and an able champion of the cause of the Mendicant Friars, it was his ability as a scholar and a teacher that did most to disarm opposition. For more than three years, though qualified to teach with the authority of a University Master, he was prevented by the violence of the opposing faction from holding his inaugural lesson. At last, however, his preëminence was acknowledged, and his personal superiority to factionism won over all but the most bitter of the "seculars." This was characteristic of the man. His heroic spirit was superior to all the pettiness of party strife, and enabled him to possess his soul in calmness in the midst of turmoil. Always courteous, serene, self-possessed, he was an ideal Christian Stoic. If the world were to fall shattered about him, the ruins would strike him unafraid, as the Roman poet said of the perfect philosopher. He calmly ignored all the recent controversy about the writings of Aristotle, frankly adopted the Aristotelian point of view and constantly referred to Aristotle as *the* philosopher. He makes no apology for borrowing even from the Arabians who were still held in abhor-

rence. According to his truly enlightened view, truth, wherever it is found, is the truth of God, and needs no recommendation except that of its truth. This was an innovation, but an innovation that disarmed opposition, because it was not proclaimed with a blare of trumpets, but quietly taken for granted. There was some surprise, in some quarters, no doubt. The staid old biographer William of Tocco harps on the novelty of Thomas' method: "He introduced *new* topics, invented a *new* and clear way of drawing conclusions, and brought *new* reasons into them, so that no one who had heard him teach *new* doubts and answer them by *new* arguments would have doubted that God had illumined him with *new* light . . . . so that he did not hesitate to teach and write *new* opinions which God had deigned *newly* to inspire." This novelty was tacitly accepted by the majority of his contemporaries during his lifetime. That it was not universally accepted is clear from what happened after his death in 1274. Within three years, the two greatest universities of Christendom put themselves on record as opposed to some of his novel doctrines. But, the opposition was temporary. Paris and Oxford soon fell in line with the rest of the learned world, and Thomas was everywhere recognized as the most authoritative exponent of scholastic intellectualism. The Scotists, it is true, continued to criticize and find fault with his conclusions. For scholasticism in spite of what is so often said to the contrary, was not one man's way of thinking. It was essentially a philosophy of discussion, and the Scotists differed fundamentally from the Thomists in their view of the question of intellect and will. Thomas was an intellectualist: all along the line he placed intellect above will. Scotus was a Voluntarist: he placed will above intellect. And thus, though Scholasticism, as a system, was perfected by St. Thomas, it was not made a "closed system," so far as his successors were concerned.

The writings of St. Thomas are many and voluminous. The greatest of them is the *Summa Theologica,* which is a marvel of order, completeness and lucidity. We are inclined to take sober thought, nowadays, at the introductory remarks in which St. Thomas tells us that the work was intended for beginners

in the sacred science. There are many of its articles which are deep enough for the most advanced student. But "there were giants in those days," and perhaps the average student then was capable of more sustained effort than we should expect in the average student of to-day. The *Summa* is a text-book, resuming in concise and systematic exposition the whole subject of philosophy and theology. Its symmetry, its completeness, its thoroughness and its perfect balance have been admired by all who have taken the trouble to examine it. To its construction all those who went before contributed the material. Albert, especially, labored with Titanic strength and true German perseverance, to bring together the brick and stone that were to go into the edifice, but it was the master mind of Thomas that arranged the materials, drew the plan and put every piece into its proper place in the finished building. The Cathedral of Cologne, that other great medieval achievement, is the only work to which the *Summa Theologica* may be properly compared. Like the Gothic structure the *Summa* is vast, complicated, and yet unified in the heaven-pointing plan, by which vault and arch, turret and pinnacle all conspire to the one general effect of lifting our thoughts from the earth beneath us to the supernatural world above us. Nature and Grace, reason and faith, natural truth and revealed truth are there articulated and subordinated and coördinated in such a way that Dante had only to put it in verse to make it a harmony in expression as it is already intrinsically a harmony of thought. For, though it is a summary of theology, it is also a summary of philosophy, treating of man, his origin, his nature, his destiny, of conduct, of law, of the family, of political organization and of social relations.

Next to the *Summa Theologica* is the *Summa Contra Gentiles*, a work undertaken for the specific purpose of furnishing arguments from reason which may be used in discussion with those who do not admit the argument from revelation. In style it is less concise, in manner less didactic, in design less complete than the other work. In a sense it is more popular, although not so frequently cited nor so often consulted. Besides these

two great works we have the special treatises on particular topics of philosophy. Among these are the curiously entitled *Quodlibeta*. In them are discussed the so-called futile questions, such as "Can an angel pass from one point to another without passing through the intermediate points?" "Can two angels be in one place at the same time?" "Does a Crusader who dies on the way to the Holy Land deserve as much credit as one who dies on his way home?" etc. We have all heard of these and similar silly questions, which cause the injudicious to smile. The injudicious, because when we examine the circumstances, we shall be more inclined, perhaps, to admire than to condemn the man who discussed them. In those days there were no newspapers with their department set aside for answering inquiries. But there were then, as there are now, those who ask silly questions. When a teacher like St. Thomas had attained fame throughout Europe, questions came pouring in on him from far and near. There were, first of all the pupils of his own classes—any professor who has had experience with beginners in philosophy will know that it is best to take such questions more seriously than the questions deserve. And then, all over Christendom, when scholars met anywhere in debate and raised a hare of controversy which they could not run down, or when a group of monks gathered in their garden after dinner and began to discuss some curious problem which they found that they could not solve, the end very often would be the suggestion to write to Brother Thomas at Paris and find out what he says. Brother Thomas did not believe in "answering a fool according to his folly." It seems to us now, as we look back, that he showed wonderful patience and extraordinary courtesy when he took such questions seriously and, after a formal discussion, gave such an answer as would satisfy the mind of the enquirer without hurting his feelings. The medieval mind was curious. It was prone to discussion. But, it had also a passion for clearness and definiteness. It slighted no question however minute; it tried to settle every question, and fit the answer into a system. In this, again, we are reminded of a peculiarity of Gothic architecture, the care and conscientiousness with

which it worked out a detail, and the equally minute pains that it took to keep the detail "in style," as we say, with the rest of the structure. It is easy to laugh at the silly questions of the scholastics, but who, once he has understood the medieval mind, would laugh at the grotesqueness of a gargoyle or other similar detail in a Gothic building?

This account of the writings of St. Thomas would be incomplete without some reference to his work as a liturgical poet. He was not, indeed, a poet of the first order. He was too reflective, perhaps, to rank with St. Francis in tenderness of feeling or with the authors of the *Dies Irae* and the *Stabat Mater* in directness of expression. But his hymns have a merit all their own. The *Lauda Sion* especially, and the *Pange Lingua,* with a portion of which Catholics are familiar as the *Tantum Ergo,* excel in the clearness with which they express definite, technical, theological thought, and are characterized by a depth of spiritual feeling that is rare in a professed philosopher. But, we should not forget that Thomas was a saint as well as a scholar. And, if in his didactic works he uses the impersonal, clear, cold, reasoning of the dialecticians, he was in heart and soul a mystic as well, and could feel as deeply as a St. Bernard the delights of mystic love and contemplation.

We had best describe him perhaps as a blending of the Christian rationalist and the Christian mystic. He had all Abelard's love of dialectic without any of Abelard's contentiousness or his lack of reverence. He delighted in the clash of argument and the thrust and parry of disputation, but had none of the vain confidence in his own powers which led Abelard into all kinds of intellectual extravagances. His reliance on the power of human reason was as wholehearted and spontaneous as that of any rationalist, but he clearly recognized that human reason has limits beyond which it cannot go. These limits he defined in reference to the highest spiritual truths, and thus formulated the principle of Christian Agnosticism. For there is a Christian Agnosticism, a limitation set by all reverential minds to our power of understanding divine things. "Who hath known the mind of God?", asked St. Paul. And

St. Augustine is emphatic in declaring that our words fall far short of our ideas about God, and our ideas are but an inadequate representation of the reality of God. St. Thomas takes the same sane view of the powers of the human mind. At the same time, he, like all other Christian thinkers, disagrees fundamentally with the modern agnostic when he holds that at the point where Reason reaches the end of its effort, Faith begins, and Faith, like Reason, is reasonable. The bird that rises on its wings through the air must come at last to a region where the rarified condition of the medium prevents its rising any higher. So it is with the mind of man. But, for St. Thomas, the region beyond the point where reason must stay its flight is not the region of nescience but the region of Faith. Thus, he is a rationalist, but a rationalist who acknowledges the limits of reason's power.

On the other hand he is a mystic. He has all St. Bernard's love of contemplation and meditation without any of his distrust of human reason. He shares with the School of St. Victor the appreciation of piety and holiness as a means of acquiring a knowledge of God, without agreeing with the Victorines in their condemnation of dialectic, or logic, as "the devil's art." In his mysticism, as in his rationalism, there is poise, balance, moderation and wholesomeness. "To love God above all things," he says, "is, in a certain way, natural to man and also to every creature, not only rational, but irrational, and even inanimate, according to the kind of love, of which the creature is capable." [2] Here we have the expression of the moderate mystic view of nature. Of St. Bernard it is related that he rode down the passes of the Alps along the shores of the Swiss lakes without once lifting his eyes to look upon scenes which may well be called the most beautiful in all the world. St. Francis of Assisi would not have done that. He considered that the beautiful things of the natural world are God's creatures, our brothers and our sisters who praise God, each in its own way, and sometimes are our superiors in the

[2] *Sum. Theol.*, I, II, CIX, 3.

fidelity with which they serve Him. Such was the opinion of St. Thomas, though expressed more reflectively, if one may say so, less spontaneously and less poetically. "Every creature loves God according to the love of which its nature is capable." It is the destiny of each of them, and it is the destiny of man to love God both here and hereafter. This principle furnishes the supreme test of the value of a life, and supplies a standard by which knowledge itself is to be judged useful or harmful. Like all the mystics, then, he distinguishes a knowledge that is unto salvation, and a knowledge that is injurious to the soul, since it prejudices the destiny of the soul. This, again, is mysticism, but mysticism restrained within the bounds of moderation, and saved from extravagance by the counterpoise of moderate rationalism.

Which of these tendencies predominated in St. Thomas, rationalism or mysticism? If we were to consider the man, the monk, the saint, we should say the mystic tendency. But, if we consider the scholar, the teacher, the writer, we should say the rationalistic tendency. His writings show him to be closer to Abelard than to Abelard's great opponent, St. Bernard. For, he is, as has been said, an intellectualist. The love of God, he thinks, is the destiny of man as it is the destiny of all creatures, but the love of God is conditioned, so to speak, by a knowledge of God, and finds its fruition in that contemplation of God wherein consists the Beatific Vision. All his emotionalism is tempered by intellectual insight and rational analysis. It is no smouldering fire that gives warmth without light; it glows to the point where it diffuses light as well as heat. This is best expressed, perhaps, by saying that in his philosophy he is the Christian Aristotle. The broad outlines of his metaphysics, his psychology, and his ethics are Aristotelian; the detailed points of doctrine are often Aristotelian also. He is no slavish follower of the Stagyrite, although he has been described as such. "The argument from authority," he says, "is the weakest of all arguments" in philosophy.[3] He follows

[3] I, 1, 8 ad 2.

Aristotle because he thinks that Aristotle is right. He follows him in the general view of the value of knowledge, and in the question of the value of life. Contemplation, he says, is to be placed above action; thought is superior to will and to emotion; man's crowning glory is his reason. His philosophy is, thus, the last classic expression of the Aristotelian view. What St. Augustine was to Plato he is to Aristotle. Even in the discussion of the highest spiritual truths he is the calm, cold, impersonal scientist, with the scientific passion for clearness of definition and systematic completeness of development. He does not condemn the Platonic way of philosophising; at least, he does not discard it entirely. For he borrowed much by way of inspiration, if not from Plato, as least from St. Augustine and the other Christian Platonists. However, he transformed what he borrowed, and like a true Aristotelian, submitted it to the discipline of definition and of logical proof. This determines his place in the history of human thought. He was no mere apologist for Christianity. He was no mere defender of orthodoxy within the limits of mental activity set around him by a Church jealous of her dogmas and her institutions. He contributed an appreciable addition to philosophy by developing, rounding out and perfecting the Aristotelian system. He has, in fact, been accused of reading into Aristotle more than Aristotle ever meant to say. It has been said that he attempts to "baptize" the Stagyrite and read Christianity into a pagan philosophy. But, we should remember that he was not a historian, nor a textual critic. He was a disciple, and may be allowed the freedom of interpretation accorded to a disciple. The charge, at least, proves that there is more in Thomas than there is in Aristotle. There is a fullness, a richness, a completeness of content in many of his philosophical doctrines that are lacking in him whom he calls "*the* philosopher." As in the case of St. Augustine and Plato, one would not dare to say that he was greater than his master. That, however, does not prevent him from improving on the doctrines of his master. Heir to all the thought and feeling of twelve centuries of Christianity, he is wiser with the wisdom of ex-

perience. Possessing, as he believes, the truth of revelation, which developes the natural powers of the mind, he carries Aristotelianism into new applications, and throws new light especially on the regions of thought in which paganism groped in the dark or followed the feeble light of reason. At the very least, he freed the philosophy of Aristotle from the false interpretations that had grown up around it in the Arabian schools and in the sects of medieval or early Christian heresy. He did more. Of Plato and Aristotle, a medieval writer says: "The former looked to the things above, the latter considered the things below"[4]—and it is thus that Raphael represents them in the School of Athens. What St. Thomas did was to show the Aristotelians how, while adhering to the method of the master and remaining true to his spirit, they may rise from the consideration of the "things below" to a contemplation of the "things above."

WILLIAM TURNER.

[4] St. Bonaventure, Sermo IV.

HEREDITY AND ENVIRONMENT.

In the new science of eugenics is to be discovered, we are told, a remedy for the social ills arising from the propagation of the unfit and parasitic members of society. Education, hailed so long as a panacea for these and other menacing evils, has, it is declared, been tried and found wanting. Says Professor Charles Richmond Henderson in his late work, *Preventive Agencies and Methods:* "For a long time in the United States skepticism as to the omnipotence of education of the abnormal and degenerate has gained in extent and influence. The cheerful optimism of Horace Mann has yielded to a more discriminating and cautious mood. Discussions in the National Conference of Charities and Correction and in the American Prison Association reveal a clear comprehension of the peril of trusting too far to education alone for social protection and we note a more decided and frequent advocacy of methods which promise to reduce the propagation of the unfit, the vicious and the habitual criminal included." [1] We gather that the Professor here takes education in the more restricted sense of mental training and equipment. But the word admits of a wider acceptation. It can be used to denote the entire body of influences that make for "guidance of growth," and hence to comprehend the pressure of environment.

Even thus broadly understood the comparative impotency of education as compared with heredity is maintained by the student of eugenics; and this too without restriction to the extreme types of degeneracy referred to in the quotation just given. "So far as our investigations have gone," says Ethel M. Edgerton, Galton research scholar, "they show that improvement in social conditions will not compensate for a bad

[1] Charles Richmond Henderson, *Preventive Agencies and Methods*, New York Charities Publication, 1910, p. 40.

heredity influence." [2] We shall consider later the validity of such conclusions. In the meantime it is necessary that we have correct and clear ideas of the two terms of the comparison here instituted. For this it is sufficient that we gain an adequate notion of heredity, since all other contrasting forces we may reckon as comprehended under the general agency—environment.

According to Ribot "Heredity is that biological law by which all beings endowed with life tend to repeat themselves in their descendants. It is for the species what personal identity is for the individual. By it a groundwork remains unchanged amid incessant variations; by it nature ever copies and imitates herself." [3]

It is seen that in its first and most obvious sense, heredity means the transmission of those characteristics that distinguish species from species. By it like tends to beget like. Men do not gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. The offspring of fish is fish, of eagles, eagles. But its operation knows a more extended scope. It is the means by which qualities recognized as racial are perpetuated. The child of the Indian is clearly marked off from the issue of the Norwegian, and the descendant of the Negro will, we know, inevitably show forth the distinctive traits of his race.

All this is accepted as commonplace. But what is to be said of the transmissibility of purely family characteristics? Clearly it is only with the inheritance of such traits that the eugenist is concerned. And that there are many instances in which a particular quality of ancestors is bequeathed to offspring we cannot doubt. We recall as striking examples of this the aquiline noses of the Bourbons and the thick lips of the Hapsburgs. But does this transmission operate in every instance with anything like a calculable certainty. As an overshadowing and compelling fate, the idea of heredity, is an

[2] Ethel M. Edgerton, *The Relative Strength of Nurture and Nature*, London, 1909.

[3] Ribot, *Heredity*, p. 1.

engaging one for the moralist and playwright. As a force breaking forth, like a second personality, at critical junctures, in a manner irresistible, lighting up with searching rays the dark vistas of an ancestral past, it allows of dramatic handling. So it has been employed by Robert Hitchens in his "Call of the Blood" and by Henrik Ibsen in his "Ghosts." For a different purpose, we hear appeal to it very often made by the morally weak and depraved. It is the refuge behind which the debauchee often seeks to hide his shame and folly, representing it as a compulsion to evil against which all the battling of his better self is vain and hopeless. "This is the excellent foppery of the world," says Edmund in *King Lear,* "that, when we are sick in fortune, (often the surfeit of our behaviour), we make guilty of our disaster, the sun, the moon, and the stars; as if we were villains by necessity; fools by heavenly compulsion; knaves, thieves, and treachers by spherical predominance, and all that we are evil in, by a divine thrusting on."

To assert and theorize, however, is a more serious matter for the scientist. For this he must have a sufficient basis of facts. And such a basis we make bold to say is, as yet, too meagre for a science of eugenics. This will appear evident we think from even a cursory consideration of the two principal generalizations regarding the measure and course of heredity. The first of these is the law of ancestral inheritance, enunciated by Sir Francis Galton, the acclaimed father of eugenics. From the study of the pedigree records of the Basset Hounds Club and the genealogical tables of the British peerage, Galton drew the conclusion that "every organism of bi-sexual parentage draws one-half of its inherited qualities from its parents, (one-fourth from each parent), one-fourth from its grandparents; one-eighth from its great-grandparents and so on." This surely looks like bringing order out of chaos. Indeed, it is so simple that it arouses suspicion. And the suspicion upon investigation is discovered to be well founded.

It is seen that according to Galton's law the characteristics of offspring are a blend or fusion of parental traits. In the

case of a tall father and short mother this blending could be discernible enough in the stature of their child. So too could it be with regard to many physical characteristics such as span, eye-color, hair-color and head measurements. Even regarding psychic qualities, supposing their transmissibility by heredity, there could be easily discovered a resultant fusion. A child of an extremely ill-tempered father and extremely amiable mother could be seen possessed of a disposition somewhere between these wide opposites. But to announce a law which would declare the exact or approximate ratio according to which the traits of parents combine in offspring, while possible quite for physical qualities, is, in the case of psychical characteristics, nothing short of gratuitous assumption. To declare, for instance, in our present state of biological and psychological knowledge, that the determination of purpose observed in a given child is in one-fourth measure due to its father, in one-fourth to its mother, in one-fourth to its grandparents, and in one-eighth to its great-grandparents is not setting forth a law. It is simply making a statement that is possessed of about as much scientific character as a formula in alchemy.

It is evident, moreover, that this law fails to cover the case of reversions or reappearances of characteristics possessed by ancestors more remote than the immediate forbears. We are all familiar with the phenomenon known as "skipping a generation," though a longer period of intervening time than this is supposed by reversion understood in its stricter sense. Tennyson, in his *Locksley Hall Sixty Years After,* refers to:

> "Evolution ever climbing after some ideal good
> And Reversion ever dragging Evolution in the Mud."

But this is only one kind of reversion. There is a form that saves from the mud. And although the phenomenon is hardly as frequent as the poet would lead us to believe, it was known and reckoned with before the time of Plutarch.[5]

[5] This writer tells us of a Greek woman who when accused of adultery after having given birth to a black child, alleged in defense that she had an Ethiopian ancestor four generations back. See also the case referred to by Flint in his *Text-book of Human Physiology*, New York, 1882, p. 895.

Again, in the view of evolutionists the law is radically defective in that it fails to reckon with the presence of variations. And variation, in the evolutionary doctrine, is not a whit less important than heredity. Indeed it is the co-factor with heredity, making for development. For if organic transmission be something undeviating, of mechanical exactness, if offspring be but the double of its parents, selection finds no place for lack of material upon which to operate, and without selection there can be no evolution. It is needless to point out that the fluctuating modifications of which Galton's law takes cognizance are quite distinct from the mutations here supposed.

Of course it is to be borne in mind that Galton's law is not for individual application. It is statistical. It is a generalization based upon numbers, and therefore, only strikes a general average. It cannot foretell just what will be the effect of heredity in this or that instance. But this for working purposes is a fatal inadequacy, giving it no more of a compelling force than is contained in the vital statistics of our insurance companies. The individual can not bring himself to think that as a social unit only he will fall under its operations. Now eugenics, as its name implies, aims at being a preëminently practical science. It proposes some very particular and even drastic legislation. But for this it furnishes a poor sanction when one of its recognized basic principles can present for individual cases mere probabilities.

Quite distinct in quality from the law we have been considering is that discovered about the year 1865 by Gregor Johann Mendel, an Augustinian monk of the village of Brünn in Austria. Studying the transmissibility of some characteristics of edible peas in his cloister garden Mendel came to the knowledge of certain principles of heredity, the establishment of which, in the words of Professor Vernon L. Kellogg of Leland Stanford University, marks "the greatest advance toward a rational explanation of inheritance that has been made since the beginning of the scientific study of the problem." [6]

[6] Vernon L. Kellogg, "Heredity and its Laws," *Independent*, August 24, 1911.

Revolutionary as was the character of Mendel's work it failed at the time to make any kind of an impression upon the scientific world. Dr. Saleeby has probably hit upon what undoubtedly is a large reason for this failure. Says this last named writer: "The pacific Darwin had at least one champion who was a master of polemics—and his work was soon noised abroad. But the Abbé Gregor Mendel had no Huxley; and there was nothing particularly sensational about his leisurely but scrupulously honest and scientific observations on the mating of different kinds of peas. Dogmatic systems did not worry themselves about peas, and Mendel did not stagger humanity with any assertions as to the origin of our kind. Hence it was that for just thirty years—and these years violently agitated about the very questions which Mendel had helped to solve—scarcely anyone had heard of his name or his work." [7] In 1900 the Dutch botanist De Vries, following along lines anticipated by Mendel, rediscovered the latter's work, and since then Mendelism has found a number of able exponents principal among whom is Professor William Bateson of Cambridge.[8]

The last named writer gives us an excellent account of Mendel's experiments from which we quote:

"Large numbers of crosses were made between peas differing in respect of one of each of these pairs of characters. It was found that in each case the offspring of the cross exhibited the character of one of the parents in almost undiminished intensity, and intermediates which could not be at once referred to one or other of the parental forms were not found.

"In the case of each pair of characters there is thus one which in the first cross prevails to the exclusion of the other. This prevailing character Mendel calls the dominant character; the other, the recessive character.

"By letting the cross-breds fertilize themselves Mendel next raised another generation. In this generation were individuals

[7] C. W. Saleeby, *Heredity*, New York, p. 61.

[8] We are surprised to find in the recent ambitious work, *The Inheritance of Acquired Characters*, by Eugenio Rignano, translated by Basil C. H. Harvey, Assistant Professor of Anatomy, University of Chicago, Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Co., no account taken of Mendelism. The author does not seem to have heard of Mendel.

which showed the dominant character but also individuals which presented the recessive character. But Mendel discovered that in this generation the numerical proportion of dominants to recessives is on an average of cases approximately constant, being in fact as three to one. There are thus in the first generation raised from the cross-breds 75 per cent. dominants and 25 per cent. recessive.

"These plants were again self-fertilized and the offspring of each plant separately sown. It next appeared that the offspring of the recessive remained pure recessive and in subsequent generations never produced the dominant again.

"But when the seeds obtained by self-fertilizing the dominants were examined and sown it was found that the dominants were not at all alike, but consisted of two classes, (1) those which gave rise to pure dominants and (2) others which gave a mixed offspring, composed partly of recessive, partly of dominants. Here also it was found that the average numerical proportions were constant, those with pure dominant offspring being to those with mixed offspring as one to two.

"To resume, then, it was found that by self-fertilizing the original cross-breds the same proportion was always approached, namely—

"25 dominants, 50 cross-breds, 25 recessives.

"Like the pure recessives the pure dominants are thenceforth pure and only give rise to dominants in all succeeding generations.

"On the contrary the fifty cross-breds as stated above have mixed offspring. But these offspring again in their numerical proportions, follow the same law, namely, that there are three dominants to one recessive. The process of breaking up into the parent forms is thus continued in each successive generation, the same numerical law being followed, so far as has yet been observed."[9]

It is unnecessary to give here the explanation offered by Mendel for this manner of inheritance. Suffice it to say that it is generally regarded as highly satisfactory. His work is preeminently more scientific than Galton's, not only because his facts unlike the latter's are established, but because, unlike the latter again, he furnishes a fundamental reason for his facts.

It will be observed from the foregoing resumé that in the findings of Mendel there were no blends, no proportionate admixture resulting from cross-mating. They evidently do not cover the cases in which the offspring presents to all appearances, a combination of the qualities of ancestors, as for instance, the Mulatto. They apply rather to the mode of inheritance

[9] William Bateson, *Mendel's Principles of Heredity*, New York, 1909.

in which the child bears a likeness to one or other of its forbears exclusively, as in the matter of sex. Whether Mendelian principles will be ever seen to find place in the first mentioned form of heredity is highly problematical.

Again only " unit characters "—characters irreducible to simpler elements—Mendelize, complex qualities not coming within the scope of the law. This it would appear allows but a comparatively narrow field for the operation of Mendelian principles. True, some of the traits we now think composite in nature may hereafter in the magic alembic of advanced biological and psychological science be factored into simpler constituents. But for this there does not appear encouraging prospects. We know that some qualities apparently simple are indeed complex. Thus Davenport tells us that the white coat color of a horse is due to several elements that are inheritable.[10] Nevertheless the Mendelian principles of heredity have been proven to operate quite extensively in vegetative life. And the practical advantages to which a knowledge of them has been turned in this order we know from the experiments of Professor Biffin with English wheats. The use to which they may be put in animal breeding recognized for some time has lately been well illustrated by Professor Castle of Harvard in the account of his experiments mostly made with guinea pigs, rabbits, mice and rats.[11]

But what of the bearing of Mendelian principles upon human heredity. Do human characteristics Mendelize? It must be said that as yet we have no convincing evidence of the transmissibility according to these laws of normal traits. It would appear, however, that certain defects or multiplicities, such as color-blindness, night-blindness, short-sightedness, brachydactylism (two joints only in fingers and toes) syndactylism (union of certain fingers and toes) polydactylism (additional fingers

[10] C. B. Davenport, *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*, New York, 1911, p. 24.

[11] William E. Castle, *Heredity in Relation to Evolution and Animal Breeding*, New York, 1911.

and toes) as also predispositions to certain diseases are passed on after this mode of inheritance.

"One of the present objects of the student of heredity," says Professor Kellicott,[12] "is to be able to state the facts of human heredity in Mendelian terms reducing many of the complex traits to their simpler elements." But there is danger that the Mendelian formula will be used without the due warrant of facts, that it will be adduced when there is only a basis of mass statistics. We submit that it has been thus employed more than once by Mr. Davenport of the Carnegie Institution of Washington in his *Heredity in Relation to Eugenics*. Again the task of factoring complex human qualities into their component elements is not one calculated to give the eugenist a sense of easy assurance. The analytical process that can discover the constituent parts of distinctively human traits is not yet discovered. And until Mendelian principles have been shown to apply to complex characteristics or human qualities can be resolved into their simpler elements we must recognize the general inadequacy of the laws of Mendel to declare the method and measure of inheritance in mankind.

Mendel did not address himself to the question of human heredity. Sir Francis Galton's work, however, as we have seen, is more comprehensive. For he has endeavored not only to show that human qualities are inheritable but also to set forth the proportion according to which such transmission in the by and large takes place. We have already offered a very broad criticism of his law. We now propose in the same general way to consider the validity of his conclusions regarding the inheritance of ability. From his study of the British peerage, the "Master of all Eugenists" discovered that the men who have distinguished themselves pretty frequently, "either by purely original work, or as leaders of opinion" are about two hundred and fifty in a million, one in four thousand, or one-fortieth of one per cent. On this basis it was found that Fellows of the Royal Society had fathers who attained to the

[12] Wm. E. Kellicott, *The Social Direction of Human Evolution*, New York, 1911, p. 141.

eminence above described with twenty-four times the frequency, eminent brothers with thirty-one times the frequency, and eminent grandfathers with twelve times the frequency, to be looked for in cases where heredity did not find play.

The mathematical precision with which this formula is put forth gives it an assuring appearance. But appearances here do not consist with facts. And this for the good reason that heredity is assumed to be the only cause operating to bring about the eminence possessed and shown by the above mentioned Fellows of the Royal Society.

That striking ability is the particular portion of some families cannot be denied. Two classical instances of this are seen in the Bach and Darwin families. Through eight generations the Bachs exhibited high musical skill while the descendants of Erasmus Darwin constituted a veritable aristocracy of science. The ability in these and similar cases is, of course, either native or acquired. The fact that it is seen to be of the same particular character in the sons as in the fathers, and of such pronounced quality would seem clearly to indicate that it was something inherent. Again, in the modern biological doctrine each child begins as it were at the beginning, just as his ancestors did before him. The Lamarckian idea that acquired characters or powers are passed on by heredity, while still numbering some adherents in France and America, is now quite generally abandoned. The notion that "my father's environment will be my heredity" can no longer be accepted. It might appear then that the ability exhibited in the persons referred to by Galton was the issue of inheritance, since the limited power of education could hardly accomplish such striking results.

Nevertheless the exclusive potency here claimed for heredity is not at all established. Education, though it cannot indeed contribute the content of a natural inheritance, is by no means a negligible element in true eugenics. Its task has been called a Sisyphean one. But such it assuredly is not. For besides an internal there is an external heritage made up of the traditions and institutions, the laws and customs of the

social organism about us. These are the legacy of education augmented and enriched by each succeeding generation. Our dependence upon this form of inheritance we are apt to underestimate. So unconsciously do we come under its sway that its pressure upon us, like that of the atmosphere we breathe, is quite overlooked. As evidence of this we need but recall the failure so frequently made on the part of irreligionists to recognize the body of traditions and customs and ideals that go so far to make up what we call Christian civilization. Disregarding and disowning these, the opponents of Christianity would claim as fruits and achievements simply of the natural law what is owing solely to the long and pervasive influence of revealed religion. Again, that which is gained from the accumulated accomplishments of the social organism of which we become a part, we would often attribute to our own inherent gifts. Thus, as Mr. Benjamin Kidd points out, we too frequently arrogate to ourselves a superiority over ruder peoples which we would describe as natural, whereas such superiority is merely due to the fact that we have fallen heirs to the equipment of a civilization of which these peoples are strangers.[13]

We may, in a measure, gauge the compelling force of this external heritage if we but observe the consequences inevitably ensuing upon the lessening or temporary stopping of its pressure upon the community about us. For just let the ordinary machinery of law and order by some cataclysm, such as war or earthquake, be interfered with even for a brief period and cruelty, rapacity and lust spring out like wild beasts from hidden and unsuspected lairs. Truly the ape and tiger, as Browning would say, have not died out in us, but are held in leash by the organism built up by a beneficent nurture.

And as of the power of this general and large form of environment so also may we in proportionate measure speak of the potency exercised by environments of a more particular and restricted kind. Take, for instance, the case of the infants of the slums. Speaking of the early mortality among these children, Dr. Caleb Williams Saleeby says: "This is one of

[13] Benjamin Kidd, *Social Evolution*, pp. 268 and ff.

the cardinal truths which emerge from the study of infant mortality, and it may be perhaps permitted to warn some students of race culture of the errors into which they are bound to fall if they do not reckon with what the student of infant mortality is constantly asserting; viz., that the babies of the slums, seen early and before ignorance and neglect have had their way with them, are physically vigorous and promising in certainly not less than ninety per cent. of cases." [14] While evidencing the sustaining though circumscribed power of heredity, no more telling example than that just given could be adduced to show the effect of what is called social heritage.

But the influences that make for destruction always gain and hold our attention better than those that upbuild and save, and there is an environment than can work just as effectively though less noticeably to ends diametrically opposite to the issues felt by the children of the slums. Of such a character was the environment to which the scholars spoken of by Galton were born and bred. This influence was clearly something more than education in the restricted sense in which this term is ordinarily used. It was an inspiring, stimulating nurture. The Bach and Darwin children, for instance, breathed an atmosphere of music and science. It was the alphabet of their earliest training, and it would be a child of poor talents indeed that would fail in such encompassing conditions to give evidence of special skill.

In ignoring this agency the distinguished eugenist has disregarded an essential element to be reckoned with in any formula that would describe the quality or measure of hereditary influence. "Not only are a large portion of Galton's men mediocrities," says Nisbet,[15] "but in his mistaken zeal for making out a case, that writer seems to have ignored the influence of family patronage and other fortuitous sources of social or official distinction." The author just quoted sees a good evidence of this fatal oversight in the statistics regarding statesmen as compared with those relating to poets and artists.

[14] Caleb Williams Saleeby, *Parenthood and Race Culture*, 1909, p. 118..
[15] J. F. Nisbet, *Marriage and Heredity*, London, 1890, p. 102.

According to Galton a statesman's chances of having a distinguished grandparent is 28 per cent., while the chances of such for a poet are only 5 per cent., and for an artist 7 per cent. Clearly these figures would show that heredity is not the agency to which we must look for an explanation of the facts here set forth. For what more natural than that a boy should seek to follow in the footsteps of a sucessful ancestor. And that many a son of an eminent father has been effectively helped to high position by the name and patronage of his immediate forbear, is a fact that may not be denied. This is palpably true in the case of statesmen. The disparity between the figures referring to statesmen and those relative to poets and artists presents no difficulty. For with the latter the elements that go to secure distinction are quite different from those that are conducive to station in the political world. Yet even in the case of poets and artists the help coming from a father's fame cannot be overlooked.

We may not conclude from the foregoing criticism of Galton's law that ability is not inherited. No such contention is here intended. For groups of more or less extent such inheritance can be established statistically. It has not, however, been demonstrated as an agency inevitably finding expression in this or that individual case. And even statistically there is clearly lacking evidence for its operation according to the formula we have been considering.

One of the most important problems for the eugenist is to differentiate heredity from environment. Yet in their present zeal to establish a case for the prepotency of the former as contrasted with the latter, a fair and judicial comparison is too generally lacking. As illustrative of this bias we may instance the manner in which the well-known story of "The Jukes" is ordinarily set forth. From the founder of this family, who lived in the first half of the eighteenth century, there sprang 1200 descendants, of whom 280 were pauperized adults, 140 criminal offenders, 60 habitual thieves and 50 common prostitutes.

The history of this wretched house, we are told, affords a

classical example of the irresistible force of heredity. Yet if it does, a more telling instance of the power of environment also could hardly be presented. For in all the cases cited by Mr. Dugdale in his sociological study of this family, there is ever felt the pressure of a most pernicious environment. Indeed, in the three pronounced instances of amended lives which he records, the reformation has been to all appearances, brought about by a change of environment, while in the one case in which heredity seems more clearly prepotent, it is admitted that "very little reliable information has been gathered about the environment." Allowing that there was in the original members of this family a strong inherent propensity to evil, the extent and continuance of the lawlessness seen in the succeeding generations can in largest measure be accounted for by environing influences. To have risen above such influences would have been for any of these creatures nothing short of the heroic.

The conclusions of Mr. Dugdale, if we suppose the qualification called for by the fundamental truth of the absolute freedom of the will, are clearly consistent with the facts discovered by his study. Says this writer, "From the above considerations the logical induction seems to be that environment is the ultimate controlling factor in determining careers, placing heredity itself as an organized result of invariable environment." And again, "The permanence of ancestral types is only another demonstration of the fixity of the environment within limits which necessitates the development of typal characteristics.[16] We may say that the same general lesson is to be gathered from the account given of the two anti-social groups known as the "Tribe of Ismael" [17] and the "Smoky Pilgrims." [18]

We know of only one work which attempts a study of the comparative influence of heredity and environment, that of

[16] R. L. Dugdale, *The Jukes, A Study in Crime, Pauperism, Disease and Heredity*, New York, 1889, p. 66.

[17] Rev. Oscar C. McCulloch, "The Tribe of Ismael, A Study in Social Degradation," *Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Correction*, 1888, p. 154.

[18] Frank W. Blackmar, "The Smoky Pilgrims," *American Journal of Sociology*, January, 1897, p. 485.

Barrington and Pearson on the relation of home conditions to keenness and strength of vision in the case of fourteen hundred school children of Edinburgh. The result of this investigation showed, we are told, that normal vision is on the whole slightly associated with overcrowding, bad economic conditions and morally defective parentage.[19] This is not very startling information for the simple reason that the conditions above described constitute only a part and that the lesser part of the environment of these children. The authors themselves suspect this, for they ask: "Can it be that these bad home conditions keep the children in the streets and so relatively away from the bad environment and in relatively fresher air." There can be no doubt about it. The "bad physical and moral conditions of the parents" force these little ones out into the open air—Nature's own health-giving spring, to gain a vigor that all the eider-down indulgence of wealth could never give. It is different, as we have seen, with the children of the slums. There the havoc is produced, because there evil environment is offered no check or hindrance. Again in a quantitative study of this kind the element of time cannot be overlooked. Environment, such as above described can only show appreciable results upon vision after a protracted period. The eyesight of Europeans is far below that of the American Indian, though this disparity is the consequence of the slow workings of environing conditions. Such a process obviously will be more prolonged the greater is the resisting capacity of the subject affected. We can hardly look for its early fruit therefore in young school children with their wonderfully recuperative powers.

We have further evidence of the indiscriminate claims made for the prepotency of heredity in much that is put forth by eugenists with regard to the effects of alcoholism. Alcohol has been styled a racial poison and many figures have been adduced to show this. Thus Dr. W. C. Sullivan in his *Alcoholism, a Chapter in Social Pathology,* tells us that "of six hundred

[19] Amy Barrington and Karl Pearson, *A First Study of the Inheritance of Vision and of the Relative Influence of Heredity and Environment on Sight,* London, 1909, p. 55.

children born of one hundred and twenty drunken mothers three hundred and thirty-five (55.8 per cent.) died in infancy or were still born, and that several of the survivors were mentally defective and as many as 4.1 per cent. were epileptic. Many of these women had female relatives, sisters or daughters of sober habits, and married to sober husbands; on comparing the death-rate amongst the children of the sober mothers with that amongst the children of the drunken women of the same stock, the former was found to be 23.9 per cent. the latter 55.2 per cent., or nearly two and a half times as much." From these and other statistics Dr. Saleeby does not hesitate to conclude: "Therefore the chronic inebriate must not become a parent. Let it be said that these people are wicked or have no self-control, drink for fun or love of degradation, then become drunkards, and prejudicially affect their children. The conclusion is the same. Have any theory of heredity you please —Lamarckian, Darwin's pangenesis, Weismannism, Mendelism, it matters not a straw. Look at the thing from the uncharitable religious point of view which realizes, in the case of these women, that to know all is to pardon all—the conclusion is still the same."

The case would seem to be clear. But it isn't. For over against this testimony must be placed that of the Galton research scholar, Miss Ethel M. Elderton, and Mr. Karl Pearson, F. R. S. From a study of the report of the Edinburgh Charity Organization Society and of an account of the children in the special schools of Manchester, these investigators were forced to the conclusion that:

"The general health of the children of alcoholic parents appears on the whole slightly better than that of the children of sober parents. There are fewer delicate children and in a most marked way cases of tuberculosis and epilepsy are less frequent than among children of sober parents.

"Parental alcoholism is not the source of mental defect in offspring.

"The relationship, if any, between parental alcoholism and filial intelligence is so slight that even its sign cannot be determined from the present material.

"The frequency of diseases of the eye and eyelids which might

well be attributed to parental neglect, was found to have little, if any, relation to parental alcoholism.

"To sum up then, no marked relation has been found between the intelligence, physique or disease of the offspring and parental alcoholism in any of the categories investigated." [20]

It must be remarked that the validity of the foregoing conclusions has been vigorously impugned and by none more vigorously than by Dr. Saleeby, but we think the objections of their critics have been fully answered by Mr. Pearson and Miss Elderton.[21]

Nevertheless the figures given by Dr. Sullivan can hardly be said to show mere coincidences. They clearly discover a casual relation. They appear, however, to exhibit instances in which the child was poisoned by a drunken mother before it was born. But this is not heredity in the biological sense of the word, it is infection, just as the evil received by the unborn child from a syphilitic mother is not a case of heredity but of infection.

The general conclusion of Mr. Pearson and Miss Elderton is that "back of extreme alcoholic excess will be found a want of will power, of self-control that is a mental defect." They should have said, of course, a moral defect. But as these authors would admit, the same must be recognized as back of all grave excesses. And until a more specific relationship is established between this antecedent weakness and alcoholism, there is no call to our sane temperance reformers to change radically their estimate of the potency, in their cause, of environing conditions.

Finally, the dependence of education upon heredity is so presented as unduly to accentuate the potency of the former. Certain it is that education can educate only what Nature gives. It is consequently of paramount importance for the

[20] Ethel M. Elderton and Karl Pearson. *A First Study of the Influences of Parental Alcoholism on the Physique and Ability of Offspring*, London, 1910, p. 31-32.

[21] Karl Pearson and Edith M. Elderton, *A Second Study of the Influence of Parental Alcoholism on Physique and Ability of Offspring. Being a reply to certain medical critics of the First Memoir and an explanation of the Rebutting Evidence cited by them.* London, 1910.

educator to know the character and capacity of the material with which he has to deal. For it remains forever true that we cannot get out of a child what does not exist in it potentially. We cannot get blood out of a turnip. But if education is thus dependent upon Nature, it devolves upon education to discover the capability and perfectibility of Nature: "Two children," says Ruskin, "go to school, hand in hand, and spell for half an hour over the same page. Through all their lives never will they spell from the same page more. One is presently a page ahead, two pages, ten pages, and evermore, though each toils equally, the interval enlarges—at birth nothing, at death infinite." [22] The difference here marked is ultimately owing indeed to disparity of native powers, but it is realized and made evident by education. As has been well said, no amount of cutting and polishing will ever be able to make a common pebble into a diamond, nevertheless it is just this cutting and polishing that makes the diamond clearly distinguishable from the pebble.

If education is dependent upon heredity, it is here seen that heredity is in no small measure dependent upon education. For the latter, like the proper soil, can alone enable the seed of native ability to know the bloom and fruitage that otherwise were impossible. And if our social reformers have heretofore given rise to the suspicion that they have been too much taken up with the soil to the neglect of the seed, there is no doubt but that the danger today lies in the tendency to reckon only with the seed to the disregard of the indispensable influence of the soil.[23]

In the pessimism ever gaining increasing ground, regarding the moral value of much of our education, we frankly share. But this precisely because of the present neglect of the essential moral content of that Nature which must necessarily condition all effective education. This, however, it must be observed, discovers no inherent and radical defect in the power of education as such, nor its impotency to effect the results rightly desired by social reformers.

[22] John Ruskin, *Time and Tide*, Par. 172.

[23] Havelock Ellis, *The Problem of Race-Regeneration*, New York, 1911, p. 22.

After all the mental capacity of society is for the most part latent and undeveloped. It has been calculated that only 10 per cent. of the resources that human society possesses have been brought into play. And it developes upon education largely, but also upon all those environmental factors generally described as opportunity, to elicit and direct these latent powers. "Where opportunity shows itself," says Scott Nearing, "genius springs into life, while a dearth of opportunity means inevitably a dearth of genius. In the cities of France thirteen times as much ability is produced, in proportion to the population, as is produced in rural districts, while in Paris the proportion of genius is thirty-five times that of the rural districts. In the cities, and in Paris especially, there is opportunity for stimulus." [24]

Education, however, is but one of the elements that go to make up environment. And despite the pessimism of the laboratory workers in eugenics, there is no danger of bankruptcy for the plans and methods of the reformers who seek to uplift their fellows by bettering social and economic conditions. Ever since Hector Gavin published in 1848 his report on the unsanitary streets and dwellings of Bethnal Green, these methods have not failed to make vast and comprehensive improvement. One need but read the *Bulletin of the Committee of One Hundred on National Health,* published under the direction and authorization of our government, to be convinced of this.[25] We quote but a sentence of this report: "When we consider that the average duration of life in India is scarcely more than one-half that of France, and less than one-half that of Sweden, we must conclude that the length of human life is dependent on definite conditions and can be increased or diminished by a modification of these conditions." And the external agencies that are thus seen to affect so largely the duration of life, cannot but as a consequence influence in no less measure the manner of life.

[24] Scott Nearing, *Social Adjustment*, New York, 1911, p. 19.

[25] *Bulletin of the Committee of One Hundred on National Health; being a Report on National Vitality, its Wastes and Conservation.* By Professor Irving Fisher, Senate Doc. 419, Washington, D. C.

It will doubtless be objected that even though the results of our advanced medicine and sanitation were known to the swarming hordes of India, the quality of their life would be but slightly bettered, just as the quality of life has been but slightly improved among the Western peples mentioned despite the advance of Occidental civilization. Says Havelock Ellis: "Here have we been expending enormous enthusiasm, labour, and money in improving the conditions of life . . . . and after seventy years we find no convincing proof that the quality of our people is one whit better than it was when for a large part they lived in filth, were ravaged by disease, bred at random, soaked themselves in alcohol and took no thought of the morrow. Our boasted social reform we are thus tempted to think has been a matter of bricks and mortar—a piling up of hospitals, asylums, prisons and workhouses—while our comparatively sober habits may be merely a sign of the quietly valetudinarian way of life imposed on a race which no longer possesses the stamina to withstand excess." [26]

That we lack the physical hardness and vigor of our ancestors of a century back is pretty certain. But this does not spell the failure of the reform that seeks its ends through improvement of environmental factors. This reform has not been, as the writer just quoted would have us believe, a matter of bricks and mortar. It has markedly lessened the ravages wrought by the ancient enemies war, famine and pestilence. And it is not without power to overcome the evil that more than anything else is at present sapping the vitality of the race. This evil, as Dr. Max G. Schlapp has lately pointed out, is the tension of our modern life. "It is that commercial ogre, our industrial system, which is sapping the strength of the race. The results of it are newly born criminals or newly born imbeciles in every grade of life high and low, irrespective of environment. Explicitly the human race is breaking itself down." [27] But the remedy for all this is not to be found in the elimination of the unfit and the multiplication of the best stock through

[26] Havelock Ellis, *op. cit.*, p. 26-27.

[27] Max C. Schlapp, "The Enemy at the Gate," *Outlook*, April 6, 1912.

the methods of eugenics. For the cause of the evil is external to us. And the improved stock would only enter upon the gruelling strain and stress to the same inevitable undoing. It is to be found in the greater husbanding of our physical and mental resources, in the simpler life more attuned to the environment with which nature would encompass us, and from which the environment, we have created in our modern industrialism, would estrange us.

We set it down therefore in conclusion that the accredited findings of biological science have not as yet the certain definite and individual character necessary to afford adequate sanction for the drastic practical reforms which our eugenists would introduce as part and parcel of their program looking to selection for parenthood, and that, moreover, in their zeal to establish the potency of heredity, these social reformers too generally disregard or obscure the true potency and extent of the factor of environment.

JOHN WEBSTER MELODY.

DR. BOLLING'S REPLY.

I have today (March 26) received Dr. Bolling's reply to my reply, but unluckily I have no copy of my own answer to his original article nor of that article itself. However, I think that Dr. Bolling has on some points the better of this fresh argument. The truth is that, in my reply, I seem to have been rather confused between my two books (1906 — 1910); Dr. Bolling had not seen the second. Perhaps I also intermixed my opinions at the moment when I was writing.

(1) As to Dr. Bolling's opinion that I "made an effort to appeal the Homeric Question from expert to popular judgment," and addressed "the general English-speaking public," in 1906; it is true that I spoke a word of comfort to "the general reader." It *might* catch his eye! But as I do not suppose that 1200 copies of any book of mine on Homer have been sold, I really could not be so sanguine as to fancy that I could influence "the general English speaking public"! The statistics of the sale of my book of 1906 were quite "disillusioning." I could not hope than any book of mine on Homer could, like Mr. Leaf's very valuable edition,—an indispensable work—appear "on the shelves of every Homeric student," but I did hope to reach some of them, and even some sixth-form boys. I did reach some eminent American and Continental experts, and British archaeologists, and was gratified by the warmth of their welcome. Dr. Bolling was not addressing an audience of experts, and his plan was to crush me by the authority of Dr. Cauer, who "waved me aside." I was all the more pleased to find Continental and American scholars, and British archæologists, receiving my work with approbation. It is quite true that I wished to reach "the less learned readers of Homer," people like myself who am no scholar and philologist; but a student of ancient poetry, heroic manners, and of archaeology. But "the less learned readers of Homer," are not "the general

English-speaking public." They are "few," and have got nothing to do with the decision of the Homeric Question. But MM. Dörpfeld and Valeton and Drerup have a voice in that matter; and they are on my side to a considerable extent.

(2) It is true that my archaeological sources in 1906 were prior in knowledge to 1901. Dr. Bolling has me there. In 1910 I think I made novel uses of Red and Black Figure vases, previously well known, but not, I think, employed much in this controversy. The vases proved that, whatever the armour pictured by Homer may be, it is certainly not the Ionian, at least not consistently so; but rather resembles the armour of the Red Figure vases: the shield not included.

(3) As to the Haghia Triade sealings, not known in 1901, I must be content to differ from Dr. Bolling's interpretation, and to agree with Sir Arthur Evans where Dr. Bolling differs from him.

(4) About Robert I know next to nothing; he seems to have very few disciples, *in this matter,* among the learned. But did I not give, in my reply, a list of very considerable authorities whom Dr. Bolling did not even mention? Far from being "reluctant to concede" that round shields occur in Homer, I wrote, in 1906, that "we do not pretend to be certain" as to whether Homer "saw shields of various types, including the round shape, in use,"—or not.[1]

(5) As to the Dipylon shields; those from Boeotia, published by Lippold, were unknown to me even in 1910,—and to most people. I could only speak of such Dipylon shields as were known to me, and they were un-Homeric.

(6) I can only assure Dr. Bolling that when translating the Iliad, thirty years ago, I, at least, felt no "incongruity" as to the line about the corslet of Patroclus. Had I felt an incongruity, and wished to dissemble it by a dodge in the printing, my two colleagues, Mr. Leaf and Mr. Myers, would not have permitted the artifice. I am unable to imagine how anybody can suppose that, to "minimise" an incongruity which

[1] *Homer and his Age,* p. 114.

I "felt," I "separated the incongruous elements so as to bring them in different paragraphs." As far as I can see this proceeding would only make the incongruity more apparent. The line (xvi, 804), if a late insertion by a late amateur of corslets, is put in the wrong place: it ought to follow lines 791-792. In these, Apollo smites Patroclus on the shoulders, an action apt to undo the corslet-clasps. One thing the readers of *The Catholic University Bulletin* may have learned from our "gentle and joyous passage of arms," namely, that I am not an isolated adventurer in the lists of the Homeric Question, but that some famous Continental scholars, and perhaps all of our archæologists and learned excavators, are, like Dr. Dörpfeld, in the main, on my side in the dispute, as is, notably, Professor John Scott in your own country.

It will be seen that on (1) my "appeal to the general English-speaking public," I cannot agree with Dr. Bolling. The extent of my hope was to prevent "less learned readers of Homer" from accepting the idea that the question is settled by Science. I had also a desire that specialists might consider my views, (though I did not expect many of them to look at my work) and this desire was gratified beyond my hope.

As to (2) I grant that Dr. Bolling is right.

As to (3) I differ from him, but the question is one of personal impressions; and probably fresh evidence may solve the problem.

As to (4) *do manus,* I confess that I was lazy about Robert, and most of his critics appeared to be unpersuaded.

(5) Lippold's Boeotian shields, and his admirable paper, were a new light to me.

As to (6) really it was *impossible* for me, had I wished it, to play a trick with the paragraphs in the translation; my friends, infinitely my superiors in scholarship, would have permitted no such *supercherie;* and I am surprized that such an artifice should be charged against us.

A. Lang.

May I add one word? I had never the slightest wish to bring against Mr. Lang or his collaborators a charge of *supercherie* with regard to the translation of the line relating to the corslet of Patroklos. On the contrary my interest in the translation arose from the very fact than there could not possibly have been in it any ulterior motive. It seemed to me perfectly unconscious—and as such valuable—testimony that the line does not harmonize with the preceding lines and I endeavored to employ it as such. I distinctly said that I regarded Mr. Lang's procedure as "the best thing possible thirty years ago," meaning by the restriction of the last phrase merely that in the light of more recent discoveries I consider it now better to bracket the line. When I wrote I thought that my meaning could be readily and easily understood, and I can now only express my sincere and deep regret that I did not succeed in making it impossible for any one to take from my writings the meaning that Mr. Lang has taken.

George Melville Bolling.

BOOK REVIEWS.

La Théologie de Saint Paul. F. Prat, S. J. Deuxieme Partie. Paris, Beauchesne, 1912. Pp. 579.

Biblical theology, as a science distinct from dogmatic, is not yet a hundred years old. It has taken on a renewed interest among Catholics since the present supreme pontiff bespoke for it a larger measure of consideration. The volume to hand, forming part of the library of historical theology published under the direction of the professors of theology in the Catholic Institute of Paris, fills, with its companion volume, a want long and keenly felt. The inherent difficulty attending the composition of a work of this kind is condensation. This difficulty the author has successfully overcome by a series of notes in fine print, which allow of a more detailed consideration of important points, the fuller treatment of which would otherwise have to be sacrificed to the exigencies of method.

The first part of the work is taken up with a searching critical review of the modern conceptions of Paulinism—evolutionary, subjective, and radical—and the various attempts—all of them too simple—to define the doctrine of Saint Paul or to discover the centre of his thought. The phrase "theology of Saint Paul" is a misnomer, but it is in possession, as the author well says, and may rightly be understood as "the sum of the divine revelations handed down through the instrumentality of the Doctor of the Gentiles." He disavows all responsibility for any other implications read into the phrase by interested parties. It has long been the fashion to seek for a central thought in the teachings of Saint Paul, and this tendency has mislead many critics into the formulation of ideas too simple altogether to hold the bursting thought of the many-sided genius they were studying. The Protestants imagined that Saint Paul was defining justification in the first five chapters of his epistle to the Romans, whereas he was refuting the Pharisees and the Judaizing party. It is this fact which Luther did not understand; hence his false theory of salvation by faith alone. Our author discusses and rejects all the mis-

guided attempts of the modern simplifiers to reduce the thought of St. Paul to a simple metaphysical formula. The thought of the Apostle to the Gentiles is neither theocentric, nor anthropocentric; it is Christocentric, and consequently his theology is a soteriology. The only comprehensive formula capable of expressing Saint Paul's mind fully, is, according to the author, the following: *Le Christ Sauveur associe tout croyant à sa mort et à sa vie.* Calvary is the true centre of Saint Paul's thought.

Is there, strictly speaking, a psychology of Saint Paul? The author decries the attempts of critics to reduce the Apostle to the level of the philosophers. A systematic psychology is no more to be found in his writings than a systematic philosophy. In fact, his psychology is biblical, and his conception of man is especially so, as may be seen in his employment of the word "heart" to designate the centre of all intellectual, moral, and sensible life, the seat of all the affections and passions. He shows some influence of the prevailing Greek culture, in the use of the terms "conscience" and "reason," but he is no crude dualist; rather is he an eclectic, who pressed into service the language of his time to express ideas personal and proper to himself, which did not come from words then in usage among the pagans, but sought these as vehicles of expression. It is vain to seek in his language the influence of Greek dualism or Asiatic pantheism, for the simple reason that it is not his psychology which inspires and dominates his theology, but the reverse. All this is brought out by the author with a wealth of detail and analysis truly admirable.

Then follow in order critical reconstructions of the doctrine of Saint Paul on the prehistory of the redemption, the person of the redeemer, and the fruits of the redemption, in which the many and varied teachings of the great Doctor are set forth in all their bearings, with an ease and grace which disposes of false interpretations, at the same time that the true meaning is made to shine forth clearly and convincingly, in the light of contemporary ideas for its setting and background, but with the distinct light of revelation made unmistakably evident all the while.

It is impossible, in the limited space allotted for this review, to give anything like an adequate idea of the precious contents of this volume. The great mistake of critics all along in reading Saint Paul has been their conspicuous neglect of the primarily spiritual, religious and moral character of his writings. He has been read in the false light of contemporary systems and made

to stand sponsor for the vagaries of modern rationalism. It is good to have this unscientific procedure rebuked and laid bare in all its naked sophistry. The whole tendency of our times is to simplify everything, to find what is called a master idea, which will explain all. The result is that liberty is taken with everything under the sun, as if forsooth a simple formula could be found for what is by nature complex. The author has dealt this method a mortal blow throughout, and in so doing has revealed the essential shortcomings of modern methods based on the systems of Kant and Hegel or on the pietism of Ritschl.

The life-size portrait of the Apostle to the Gentiles has been restored, and the caricatures drawn by critics have been revealed in all their prodigious deficiency, by the author of this scholarly volume, who attempts no composite photograph after the manner of his times, but seeks to paint true to life the distinct personality of Saint Paul. One impression which the modern critics should receive from a reading of this work of Father Prat is *breadth* of method and sympathy of treatment. Instead of running round in search of literary and philosophical ancestors to explain the genesis of his illustrious subject, Father Prat first tries to grasp the mind of Saint Paul in its complex fulness, and once he has succeeded in this, he has on his hands and before his eyes a problem of originality and distinctiveness to explain, and not one of dependence or reducibility. There is so much partial criticism now in vogue, so much of this habit of comparing detached phrases of one man with detached phrases of another, that it is a relief to see a criticism that aims at being integral and complete. The total effect of the employment of such a just method is to accentuate the smallness of prejudice and the greatness of truth.

Bibliographies, a philological and topical index, extensive notes, all the scientific apparatus of the best works of this kind, abound. In matter and manner, the volume is masterly. It ought, with its companion volume, to be on the shelf of every professor as a most welcome addition to his library; for it is a work which we have long needed from a Catholic source, and now have at last, to set over against the volumes of Stevens and others. *Si monumentum quaeris, circumspice!*

EDMUND T. SHANAHAN.

Tractatus de Deo Creatore. G. Van Noort. Van Langenhuysen, Amsterdam, 1912. Pp. 204.

This is as clear a presentation of the subject-matter of this tract as the reviewer has ever seen. In fact, the clearness is remarkable both in thought and language. One is not surprised that a second edition has followed so fast on the heels of the first, the reason therefor being all too apparent. It would be invidious to single out one part of the treatment for special commendation; nevertheless we venture to say that the chapters on creation, the supernatural, and the effects of original sin are exceptionally well done. The criticism of evolution is cogent and incisive, the author manifesting a thorough grasp of his subject on its scientific and theological sides. The question of the supernatural is treated with a rare discrimination, and the student must be dull indeed who would not profit by the exposition. We think, however, that the author would have made his point better, on the vexed question of what St. Thomas meant by the naturalness of man's desire to see God, if, instead of trying to reduce the texts to logical consistency, as he does, a more satisfactory solution had been sought in the mental development of Saint Thomas himself. At the time that Saint Thomas wrote the statements which he afterwards corrected, he was still under the influence of Saint Augustine's historical point of view, and had not yet clearly formulated the distinction between actual and possible man. Hence it is only reasonable to suppose that his language should have been inconsistent, because of the change in the angle of view. This psychological way of settling the discrepancy in the texts seems more convincing than any attempt at a logical explanation of the difficulty. But this is a minor matter, made much of only by modernists in their grasping at straws, and detracts in no wise from the solidity of the exposition.

The reviewer also thinks that the "middle theory" of the divine motion is deserving of more than a passing mention in a foot-note (p. 37). The conception of an intrinsically efficacious motion which is not predetermining in character, or in any sense temporally prior to the creature's action, rids the problem of many conceptual difficulties. By conceiving the divine motion as identical with the operation of the creature, and by regarding the free mode of this motion as within it rather than without, the mul-

tiplication of the "concursus divini" is rendered unnecessary and superfluous. "Unicus motus nostrae operationi identicus" sufficit. This motion, efficacious in itself, is objectively conditioned by the consent of the creature if the latter be free. In other words, God does by one all-inclusive motion, containing both the motion and its mode, what in the other theories He does successively and not simultaneously. This theory of Cajetan, Pecci, Satolli, and others shows its worth by the consistent light it throws on the problems of foreknowledge, grace, and predestination. We feel quite sure that, on looking into the matter, the author will agree with the reviewer as to the title of this middle theory to a more detailed recognition. It avoids predeterminism and the "scientia media," and in doing this it makes a contribution to simplicity and clearness, which will appeal to the author's sense of these two virtues.

We are glad to see that the author rejects as insufficient explanations of original sin the theories of pact and inclusion, which increase rather than diminish the difficulty of accounting for its transmission to posterity. We are also impressed with his good sound reasoning on the meaning of the axiom, "vulneratus in naturalibus," which he rightly understands to imply a privative and not a positive intrinsic deterioration. Throughout, the impression is constant that every point has been well weighed in a good Catholic balance, and that the author has been most judicious in selecting both the matter and the manner of his presentation.

An alphabetical index, abundant notes, references, citations, and sagacious reflections make the volume still more valuable to the student. The former professor at Warmund is publishing his course, and this is the eighth volume that has appeared, or rather the second edition of the fifth volume in the series. We wish it and its companion volumes every success, and we recommend them to students and professors as models of clear and judicious presentation. The present work maintains the reputation established by its predecessors.

EDMUND T. SHANAHAN.

Lehrbuch der Dogmatik. Dr. Bernhard Hartmann. B. Herder, St. Louis, 1911. Pp. 861.

This manual of theology is out of the ordinary in many respects. It follows the thesis form of presentation, as all works of the kind

naturally should. But it strikes at modern errors directly and puts each thesis in a modern setting, with the result that the student sees Catholic truth in its bearings on the agitated problems of the day. Observing the true scholastic principle that scriptural, positive, and rational theology are distinct but not separate parts of one organic whole, the author presents all three unitedly, thus showing in a convincing manner that Catholic theology has its roots struck deep in revelation and is not the purely human product which modernists claim. This method of presentation equips the student to cope with modern thought directly, and sharpens his wits as well as his weapons for the adversaries with whom he is destined to deal. Each thesis has what is of faith clearly indicated right after the statement of the thesis itself. Then follow the Scripture proofs, the history, the proofs from reason, and the errors opposed to the doctrine. There is an orderliness about the whole volume which makes it of great value to the student.

The author seems to have everybody in view, student, teacher, adversary, and preacher. All may dip into this volume with profit. Special attention is paid to the Scripture proofs of doctrine, and thus one gap which modern adversaries try to open up between theology and Holy Writ is effectively closed. This is a most commendable feature of the work. Formerly the claim was put forth that dogmas were let down ready made from the skies. Then the modernists gave currency to the false idea that dogmas were nothing more than the product of man's reflection. To combat these two false conceptions it is necessary to show the supernatural origin of each dogma and to accentuate its agreement with revelation. This the author does most clearly and commendably, showing the initial statement and subsequent phases of the development of each dogma, and always insisting on the connection and agreement of each phase with revelation. The supernatural premisses of all the dogmas are pointed out and the logical consequences laid bare. It is a timely piece of work, and we wish it all success. A fine topical index crowns the usefulness of the volume.

It is good to see the actuality of treatment which characterizes this manual, especially the decisive word which the author has to say on current biblical problems connected with dogma. The work was first printed in manuscript form for his students at Paderborn. It is now sent forth to a larger public in the hope of accomplishing a larger good.

EDMUND T. SHANAHAN.

La Paroisse. Discours choisis de nos orateurs, par le Chanoine Jean Vaudon. Tome I. L'Installation, La Prise de Possession. Les Prêtres de la Paroise. Paris, Bloud & Cie, 1911. 4 frs.

Canon Vaudon has rendered a genuine service to the clergy in the publication of this collection of sermons by various authors on the priest and his relations to his parish, to the Church and to society. Its first purpose is to offer help and suggestion to the preacher, but it will also appeal to many as a book holding forth a high and correct ideal of the priestly vocation. *La Paroisse* is the first volume of a series which is to comprise discourses on religious subjects by some of the best modern pulpit orators of France, England, Belgium and Italy, and which will also, according to the promise of the compiler, enable us "entendre des voix laiques, ardentes, excitantes, généreuses."

JOHN T. CREAGH.

A Practical Handbook for the Study of the Bible, by Dr. Michael Seisenberger. Translated by Buchanan and Gerrard. New York, Joseph F. Wagner, 1911. 8vo., 491 pp. $2.00 net.

This book of introduction to the study of the Bible contains in a succinct form a large amount of useful information. In the first 150 pages the author describes the geography, history, and sacred antiquities of the Holy Land, the tabernacle and its final substitute, the temple, the priesthood, the sacred rites, customs and festivals. The next hundred pages contain the General Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures, embracing the important subjects of Inspiration, the Canonical Books, the Original Texts, and the Ancient Versions. Then follows the Special Introduction of about 200 pages, in which the date, authorship, and synopsis of contents of the several books of the Old and New Testament are summarily treated. This part is characterized by a careful conservatism, kept well within the limits prescribed by the recent papal instructions and the decisions of the Biblical Commission. It offers a safe and rapid survey, suited to the seminarian as a textbook, and to the busy priest as a book of reference, but leaves untouched some of the difficulties raised by the serious study of

biblical questions. The rest of the book sets forth the principles of biblical interpretation. The works of reference are with but few exceptions German. As a bibliography, even for German readers, it makes no mention of some works of first rate importance. The translators could have made the list, even as it stands, more useful for English readers, had they indicated those which may be found in an English translation. The book has a useful series of maps, but the names of places are those, not of the Douay but of the King James' version.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Our Priesthood, by the Reverend Joseph Bruneau, S. S., D. D. St. Louis, B. Herder, 1911. 12mo., 133 pp. 90 cents net.

A good book for spiritual refreshment is always welcome. Such is the book under review. The author, respected alike for his piety and learning, presents to the reader the series of conferences which he delivered to his seminary students in preparation for the various grades of Holy Orders. It is an admirable and highly edifying exposition of each rite of ordination, from tonsure to the holy priesthood, using the Latin text as the basis, and setting forth each grade in its meaning, its end, its dignity, its demand for special priestly virtues. Its style is easy, simple, direct, well suited to the matter in hand. As an exhortation to sacerdotal perfection it deserves great praise and widespread recognition.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

Lourdes; les Apparitions, par le Cte Jean de Beaucorps. Paris, Bloud et Cie., 1911. 12mo., 300 pp.

The purpose of this little volume is to set forth the story of the life of Bernadette Soubirous and the apparitions which she had of the Blessed Mother of God above the famous grotto of Lourdes. It is not a new story, having been told with fulness of detail by Cros, d'Estrade, and retold in more succinct form by Bertrin, Boisserie, and others. To this more than twice told tale the present author has sought to give a certain freshness by supplementing the account with minor information obtained from personal inter-

views with some of those who knew Bernadette and were in part witnesses of her extraordinary experiences,—her brother, her aunt, and her companions Mlles. Ribettes, Moura, and Abadie. The first three parts of the volume describe the apparitions, tell how they were received by the common folk, the civil authorities, the clergy, and relate the edifying life of the simple peasant girl, particularly her last years in the convent of Nevers. The last part is devoted to a vindication of the reality of the apparitions.

CHARLES F. AIKEN.

The Utopia of Sir Thomas More. Edited with Introduction, Notes, and Glossary, by William Dallam Armes, M. L., Associate Professor of American Literature, University of California. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1912. Price 60 cts., net. Pp. lxi + 346.

Professor Armes has deserved well of all who are engaged in teaching advanced English, and his compact edition of More's *Utopia* is certain of a hearty welcome. The Introduction, to which much care has obviously been given, is in six parts. First there is a beautifully sympathetic life of More, containing all the principal incidents in his chequered but glorious career, and a detailed and affecting presentation of the dramatic scene enacted on the scaffold before the martyr's head was struck off. Then follows an account of the early editions of the *Utopia,* with an appreciation of the work as a first-fruit of the Renaissance in England. Two very illuminative short articles are devoted to More's literary art and the purpose of his book. Finally there is a satisfying account of Ralph Robynson and his translation of More's work from the original Latin into English. The text followed is in the main that used by Robynson in his first edition (1551), but the spelling and the paragraphing have been modernised. In an Appendix there are given certain matters that appeared for the first time in the second edition (1556) of Robynson's translation. There are 78 pages of scholarly notes, a glossary, and an analytical index.

The editor is to be warmly congratulated on the result of his labours, and the publishers have done their part by turning out

the book in clear type and in a handsome cover. I have rarely seen a better all-round edition of an English classic.

P. J. Lennox.

An Unnatural Mother. By Slieve Foy. London, Lynwood and Co., Ltd., 12 Paternoster Row. 1911. Price 3*s.* 6*d.* Pp. 246.

Slieve Foy is a pseudonym which thinly veils the identity of a new Irish writer, whose real name is entirely racy of her native soil and of her Catholic creed, and who among a wide circle of friends and acquaintances is highly esteemed not only for her intellectual gifts but for the geniality and kindliness of her disposition. We who know her know that Slieve Foy has a heart of gold. For a long time past I have been looking out for her first novel, and as the years sped by I was somewhat disappointed when it came not. Hence I welcome with joy the evidence given by the book now before me that its author has not abandoned her earlier aspirations.

An Unnatural Mother shows that Slieve Foy possesses one essential gift of her craft: she knows how to tell a story of such interest that, in the words of Sir Philip Sidney, it "holdeth children from play, and old men from the chimney corner." Her plot construction is skilful, and the gently-touched but deftly-handled incidents on which she rests the pivotal points of her narrative are so natural as to give no clue to their consequences until the end is reached and one looks back, in a lingering and admiring review, on the artistic symmetry of the whole story. In character drawing she is also strong. Jane Mudie, Dr. Kingslake, and Alona are fine types. I think, however, that the author errs somewhat in following too closely the example of Mr. Charles Garvice, who has secured his popularity by depicting deep-dyed villains and smug-faced hypocritical rogues on the one hand, and on the other, unspotted, pure-souled, almost angelic mortals endowed, like Berkeley, with every virtue under heaven. Practice makes perfect, and I feel confident that Slieve Foy will in future novels prove that she realises the value of restraint in this important department of her work.

One other defect I ought also to point out. It is obvious that considerable difficulty was experienced in disposing of the beautiful but fiendish Mrs. Angleson, for while we are vaguely told that Nemesis with unsheathed sword is on her track, she remains in actual fact the wife of an American millionaire. Most women at all events will agree that this is scarcely poetic justice, and that there are worse punishments in the world than such a rôle necessarily implies. It may be, however, that the unnatural mother is being reserved for future service, and that we are to have a further instalment of her fate and fortunes when she leaves Paris with Mr. Jefferson and reaches her new Chicago home.

P. J. Lennox.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Plan for the Affiliation of Colleges and High Schools to the University.

Pope Leo XIII, the founder of the Catholic University, says in his Apostolic Letter, "Magna Nobis Gaudia," of March 7, 1887: "We exhort you all that you shall take care to affiliate with your university, your seminaries, colleges, and other Catholic institutions according to the plan suggested in the Constitutions, in such a manner as not to destroy their autonomy."

The Pope in these words seems to have realized what has since become an urgent need in our educational system and to have anticipated a movement that is now quite general among our teaching communities. The establishment of the Schools of Philosophy, Letters and Science, offering courses of special interest and utility to lay students, naturally suggested some sort of articulation between the University and the colleges. On the other hand, the Sisters who attended the first session of the University Summer School in 1911, have frequently expressed their desire for affiliation with the University in preference to any arrangement that might be offered by other Universities, and some of our institutions have already applied for affiliation.

In view of these facts, and in order to establish a standard for our colleges and schools, as well as to secure due recognition for the institutions that are doing good work, the Trustees of the University, at their meeting on April 17, prescribed the following conditions for affiliation:

AFFILIATION OF COLLEGES

Any Catholic college may be affiliated to the University on these conditions:

1. The college must include at least seven chairs or departments and each chair or department must be under the separate direction of at least one professor or instructor.
2. Every instructor in the faculty must have at least the A. B. degree from a college of recognized standing and every head

of a department must have at least an M. A. degree from a college in good standing.

3. The equipment of the college in libraries and laboratories must be sufficient to secure effective work in the branches offered.
4. The college must require for entrance the completion of a four years' successful course in an accredited secondary school (high school), or the passing of entrance examinations on the subjects required in the curriculum of accredited secondary schools.
5. The college course must include 2,160 hours of class work distributed over four years. Two hours of laboratory work are to be regarded as equivalent to one hour of class work.

AFFILIATION OF HIGH SCHOOLS

Any Catholic high school may be affiliated on the following conditions:

1. The high school must give a course extending over four years and including a total of 15 units, of which at least three must be devoted to English and three to some other one subject.

   Meaning of unit. A subject, *e. g.*, English, pursued four or five hours a week for a school year of from 36 to 40 weeks, constitutes a unit.
2. The subjects required with their respective values are: Religion, 2 units; English, 3 units; some other language, 2 units; mathematics, 2 units; social science (including history), 1 unit; natural science, 1 unit. Four units to be elective. They must be selected in such a way, however, as to give another course of 3 units; *i. e.*, one or more units must be advanced work in one of the subjects, other than English, enumerated above. Where Latin is to be pursued in college, at least 2 units of Latin must be taken in the high school.
3. Reasons for this curriculum.
   (a) The high school has two functions: one is to give an education to students who will not go beyond the high school, the other is to give a proper preparation to students who will go to college. Hence some subjects are necessary for both classes of students, while other subjects are

necessary for only the one or the other class. All students need: Religion, English, mathematics, and a second language in addition to English. The student going to college with a view to theology or law will need Latin, Greek and modern languages, together with social science; if he contemplates the study of medicine he will need more in the line of natural science, *e. g.*, biology and chemistry. The student who goes no farther than the high school will need more in the way of mathematics, modern languages, economics and the vocational subjects.

(b) The proposed curriculum, by requiring advanced work in at least two subjects, prevents the smattering which gives the student a little of many things and not much of any thing.

(c) At the same time sufficient latitude is allowed to enable the student to determine his vocation and to begin his preparation for it before he leaves the high school.

(d) The curriculum does not prescribe Latin for four years; hence a student, who after one or two years in the high school, may discover a vocation for a career in which Latin is specially required, *e. g.*, the priesthood, can, without loss of time, take up Latin, say in the third and fourth years, and complete his study of that language during his four years at college.

EXECUTION OF THE PLAN OF AFFILIATION

With these standards of high school and college in view, the University will proceed as follows in affiliating any institution:

1. The school or college applying for affiliation shall submit to the University, on blanks supplied by the University, a detailed statement of its curriculum and equipment and of the qualifications of its professors or instructors.
2. If this statement is satisfactory it shall be verified by personal inspection through some person delegated by the University for that purpose.
3. Should this report be favorable, the institution in question shall be placed on the list of affiliated institutions.
4. The University shall then send to the institution an assignment of the matter for each subject offered in the curriculum of

the institution and, at the end of the year, a set of examination questions sealed and to be opened in the class when assembled for examination. The papers are then to be sealed in the presence of the class and forwarded to the University, where they will be examined and marked according to a certain scale.

5. All students who successfully pass the examinations held during the four years in the high school shall be admitted without further examination to any college affiliated by the University. All students who successfully pass the examinations held during the four years in college shall be admitted, without further examination, into the courses in the University leading to the higher degrees. They must, however, reside in colleges approved by the University.
6. If it should appear, either from the statement submitted or from inspection, that some modification is needed in order to comply with the requirements, the institution shall be placed on the list of tentative affiliation and, when the requirement is fulfilled, the institution shall be placed on the list of permanent affiliation.
7. In all cases, either of permanent or of tentative affiliation, a record, as shown by examination papers, shall be kept by the University of the work done each year by each student in each affiliated institution, and a copy of this record shall be sent to the institution in which the student resides and to the high school or college from which the student graduated. Should it appear from such records that the work of an institution is unsatisfactory, the University shall endeavor to discover the cause of the defect and to indicate the remedy.

The Sisters College Building Fund.

The Board of Trustees at their meeting on April 17 ratified the purchase of the property for the Sisters College and took the necessary steps to realize the project at the earliest possible date. Several Sisterhoods have already selected sites for their future homes on the grounds assigned for the community residences. They are having plans and specifications drawn up and

it is hoped that they will begin building operations in a very short time. In fact, they are only waiting for permission to break ground. This, however, can not be given to them until there is sufficient funds on hand to have the grounds prepared, the drainage taken care of and a heating conduit built from the University power house. Moreover, one of the academic buildings, at least, will be necessary in order to give room for the lectures and laboratory work. These various items will entail considerable outlay, $100,000 at the least.

A few friends of Catholic education have already contributed or pledged $14,225, and it is believed that the remainder of the sum will not be long withheld from so worthy a cause.

The Sisters College will unify the Catholic school system of the United States; its beneficent effects will be felt in every parochial school as well as in the academies and colleges conducted by our teaching Sisterhoods.

The following are the contributions and pledges thus far received:

Mrs. Samuel Hill	$3,000
Mr. and Mrs. Cabot Ward	3,000
Rt. Rev. John Nilan, D. D.	1,000
Rt. Rev. Mgr. Shahan, Rector	1,000
Miss Kate Jackson	1,000
Mrs. Cutting	1,000
Mrs. Robbins	1,000
A Friend	1,000
P. J. Gormley	500
T. E. Shields	500
A Friend	500
A Friend	200
John J. Early	100
P. J. Clark	100
A Friend	100
Mrs. Helen Morton	100
Mr. D. Sullivan	100
George Walker	50
Barber & Ross	50
P. J. Nee	50
Mrs. Gahan	25

Summer Session of the Sisters College.

The second summer session of the Sisters College of the Catholic University of America will be held from July 1 to August 9, 1912. The office of the Registrar will be open for the registration of Summer School pupils from 9 A. M. to 6 P. M. on Saturday, June 30.

SCOPE OF THE SUMMER SESSION

The summer session of the Sisters College has been organized to give Catholic teachers an opportunity to profit by the facilities which are offered by the University and to obtain under Catholic auspices whatever may be helpful to them in their work. The courses include both the professional subjects which are of vital importance to every teacher and the academic subjects which are found in the usual school curriculum. Each subject is treated with a view both to content and method, and the aim throughout is to base educational theory and practice on Catholic principles.

The high character of the work done by the students at the summer session last year and the indications pointing to a large increase in the number of students who will attend the coming session have made it seem advisable to widen the scope of the work. The courses given last year, with few exceptions, will be repeated and new courses will be organized to continue the work from the point reached in the courses of last summer. These continuation courses are marked by an asterisk and are open to all students who successfully completed the work in the preliminary course in 1911, or who pass a successful examination at the beginning of this session in the matter covered by last year's course. However, where the nature of the work is such as not to demand continuity of treatment, *e. g.*, history, the work of last year will not be repeated this year, as all students wishing to follow the course may take up the work of this year.

ACADEMIC CREDIT

I. All the courses offered in the summer session are of collegiate grade. Each lecture course extends over 30 hours and if a successful examination be passed at the end of the session, will be credited towards a degree on the basis of 30 class hours taken at this University during any other portion of the school year. Laboratory courses cover ten

hours a week and will count as half that number of hours towards a degree.

II. A student may not take more than four credit courses, but may attend occasional lectures in such other courses as she may see fit.

III. Credits earned in other colleges of approved standing, when filed with the Registrar, will count towards degrees in this University.

IV. Credits gained through correspondence courses, when duly certified and filed with the Registrar, will count towards degrees.

V. Students may take examinations for advanced standing in any of the courses in the summer session, but notice of such intention should be sent to the Dean of the summer school before June 30. Examinations for advanced standing will take place on July 1.

VI. Credits will also be allowed for successful experience in teaching. Application for such credit must be made to the Dean.

VII. Two years of college work, or one-half of the total credit for the A. B. degree must be earned by courses taken in residence at colleges of approved standing. One year's college work, or one-fourth of the total credit earned, must represent work done in residence at this University.

VIII. Degrees may be taken by the pupils of the summer session under the faculties of Science, Letters, or Philosophy by complying with the conditions set forth in the year-book of the University. The following group has been organized by the Department of Education with a view to the special needs of teachers. It will be noted that the courses are arranged in a schedule of two hours a week throughout the school year. Each of these courses may be covered in two summer sessions.

Courses Leading to the Degree of Bachelor of Arts

First Year

Subject:	*Hours per week.*
Religion	1
Science and Art of Study, ½ year, Primary Methods, ½ year	2
English	2
Latin or Greek	2
French or German	2

Subject:	Hours per week.
Chemistry, Physics or Biology (with laboratory)	4
Mathematics	2
History	2
	17

Second Year

Religion	1
Philosophy of Education	2
Philosophy	2
English	2
Latin or Greek	2
French or German	2
Drawing (with 2 lectures, 4 hrs. practice)	4
Elective	2
	17

Third Year

Religion	1
Psychology of Education	2
History of Education	2
School Management	2
Sociology	2
Music	2
Electives	6
	17

Fourth Year

Religion	1
General Methods	2
History of Education	2
History of Philosophy	2
General Psychology	2
Ethics (1st Session) / History (2d Session)	2
Electives	6
	17

ADMISSION

Students are not required to pass an entrance examination, but if academic credit be desired the student should consult the Dean and present to him sufficient evidence to entitle her to matriculate as a college student. Registration and matriculation should be attended to as soon as possible after arrival at the University.

LOCATION

Students of the summer school arriving at the Union Station, Washington, should purchase tickets to University Station, on the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and have their trunks rechecked. The most convenient way to reach the University is by the electric car marked "Brookland" going north on North Capitol St., one square west of the station. On arriving at the University grounds, the student should go directly to the Registrar's office in McMahon Hall, where they will be assigned to the rooms reserved for them. Students who expect to arrive in Washington later than 6 P. M. should notify the Registrar in advance by letter or by telegram of the time of their arrival so that arrangements may be made to receive them.

EXPENSES

The tuition fee is $25, which entitles the student to enter such courses as she may desire. No student, however, will be allowed to earn credits in more than four courses. An additional fee of $5 will be charged for materials used in laboratory courses. All tuition fees should be paid to the Registrar at the time of registration. No reduction will be allowed in board or tuition for late entrance or for withdrawal before the end of the session.

ACCOMMODATIONS

Accommodations will be provided on the university grounds for as many Sisters as possible. For board and rooms a uniform charge of $40 will be made for the six weeks of the summer school. An additional charge of $10 will be made for Sisters who remain for the retreat. No Sisters will be allowed to board in private families; they must reside on the university grounds or in some convent. Special provision, however, may be made for temporary convents in furnished houses in Brookland. Application for accommodations should be made as early as possible. The more desirable rooms will be assigned to those first applying. No Sister should come to the University without previously having ascertained that suitable accommodations have been secured.

UNIVERSITY POST OFFICE

The university post office in McMahon Hall will be open during the summer session. To avoid confusion the address should include the title of the community as well as the Sister's name.

TEXT-BOOKS

Text-books used in the various courses may be obtained at the university book store, but it would be well wherever possible to forward a list of the text-books desired a few weeks before the opening of the summer school, so that a sufficient supply may be on hand.

SPIRITUAL RETREAT

At the close of the summer session an eight-day spiritual retreat will be conducted by the Very Reverend Paschal Robinson, O. F. M.

COURSES OF INSTRUCTION

Education

1. THE PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION. A discussion of the facts, principles and theories which serve to determine the nature of the educative process and the aims and ideals of Catholic education. The course will be a continuation of that given last year under the title "The Principles of Education," and will complete the work called for in the second year of the Educational group. 9 A. M. daily.—*Thomas Edward Shields.*
2. PRIMARY METHODS. The general rules of method will be illustrated in the work of the first three grades. Special emphasis will be laid on the method of *teaching religion to little children.* 8 A. M. daily.—*Thomas Edward Shields.*
3. CATHOLIC SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION AND MANAGEMENT. Organization of Catholic schools; their relation to ecclesiastical authority; supervision; certification of teachers; standardization; curricula and text-books; details of school construction, equipment and maintenance; classroom management. 8 A. M. daily.—*Patrick J. McCormick.*
4. HISTORY OF EDUCATION. Renaissance and Reformation Period, continued. 9 A. M. daily.—*Patrick Joseph McCormick.*
5. METHODS OF TEACHING RELIGION. Historical outline of the subject; Christ's manner of teaching; the principles applied

by the Church; recent developments of method. 12 noon daily.—*Edward A. Pace.*

Philosophy

6. Genetic and Comparative Psychology. A survey of the more important theories concerning mental development and the lower forms of consciousness. 10 A. M. daily.—*Edward A. Pace.*

6*a*. The Psychology of Education. An account of the mental processes and psychological laws upon which the theory and practice of education should be based. Particular attention is given in this course to the discussion and refutation of prevalent errors that tend to undermine Catholic faith and morals. 5 P. M. daily.—*Leo L. McVay.*

7. Psychology I. A general course, including historical outline, discussion of methods and current theories with special reference to problems bearing on the philosophy of mind.—*Charles A. Dubray.*

8. Introduction to Philosophy. A survey of the field of Philosophy; its divisions, methods and principal problems; the more important philosophical systems. 4 P. M. daily.—*Thomas V. Moore.*

9. History of Philosophy. Ancient Philosophy. Development of philosophic methods, systems and terminologies in the Oriental, Greek and Roman schools; influence on Patristic and Scholastic philosophy. 8 A. M. daily.—*William Turner.*

10. Logic I. Analysis of mental processes from the point of view of clearness, consistency and validity; examination of arguments; rules of reasoning; estimation of evidence; logic of the sciences. 10 A. M.—*William Turner.*

11. Logic II.* The course in Logic begun last year will be completed. The course is open to all students who took the work at the last summer session or who pass an examination in the matter covered last year. 12 noon daily.—*James J. Fox.*

12. Ethics. 1. Character and scope of Ethics—various systems of Ethics; criticism of chief erroneous systems. 2. Conduct—human acts and their end; principles regarding responsibility. 3. Morality of human acts—on what it depends. 4. The norm of right conduct—the objective norm; the interpretative norm; the obligatory norm—ultimate, God; immediate consequences. 5. Natural law and its properties—the eternal law. 6. The nature and origin of right—right and duty are correlatives; the nature and origin of society—civil authority. 10 A. M. daily.—*James J. Fox.*

13. Sociology. The course in sociology is designed as a general introduction to the science, laying the foundation for intensive study of special problems. During the session of 1912 endeavor will be made to explain the nature and scope of sociology, to analyse social groups, showing their physical and psychical bases, the forms and functions of association, the factors preserving social order and those making for change, and to outline the principal present-day problems and efforts at social reform. As far as possible, the work will be coördinated with the sciences of psychology, ethics and economics. Attention will be directed to the practical bearing of social theory. 5 P. M. daily.—*Francis P. Lyons.*
14. Elements of Political Economy. Examination of the basic facts of economic life. The principles underlying production, consumption and valuation of goods and of services. 4 P. M. daily.—*Frank O'Hara.*

Mathematics

15. Algebra. Selected topics in elementary algebra—factoring, fractions, linear equations and problems, theory of exponents, radicals, quadratics, simultaneous quadratics—with special reference throughout to graphical representation. 10 A. M. daily.—*James F. Connor.*
16. Advanced Algebra.* Graphs of linear and quadratic expressions; progressions; logarithms; theory of equations: determinants. 10 A. M. daily.—*Aubrey E. Landry.*
17. Plane Geometry. Review of theorems in Books I and II, followed by a more extended treatment of the later books. Solution of originals will be insisted on throughout the course. 9 A. M. daily.—*Alfred Doolittle.*
18. Geometry.* The first part of this course will be devoted largely to drill in the solution of originals in plane geometry. It is expected that from one-third to one-half of the time will be spent on solid geometry. 11 A. M. daily.—*James F. Connor.*
19. Plane Trigonometry. Functions of acute angles; the right triangle; extension of formulæ to angles of any magnitude; functions of the sum and difference of two angles, and allied formulæ; the oblique triangle. The theory and use of logarithms will be treated in connection with the solution of triangles. 11 A. M. daily.—*Alfred Doolittle.*
20. Plane Analytic Geometry.* Rectangular and polar coördinates; the straight line and circle; transformation of coördinates; tangents and normals; loci; conic sections. 11 A. M. daily.—*Aubrey E. Landry.*

Science

21. PHYSICS I. Mechanics, Sound, Light. 3 P. M. daily.—*Louis H. Crook.*
22. PHYSICS II.* Heat, Magnetism, Electricity. 5 P. M. daily.—*Louis H. Crook.*

Laboratory work to accompany both courses in Physics will be taken under Louis H. Crook with the assistance of John Joseph Widmayer and John J. Greer. The experiments will familiarize the students with all of the instruments used in the accurate quantitative measurement of the most important magnitudes in the subjects studied. Two hours daily.

23. CHEMISTRY I. Elementary Chemistry. The matter covered will be that usually treated in elementary text-books on chemistry. In the laboratory work McPherson and Henderson's Laboratory Manual will be supplemented and varied by the Instructor's notes. Five lectures a week, one written quiz, and ten hours laboratory. 3 to 6 P. M. daily.—*Ignatius A. Wagner.*
24. CHEMISTRY II.* The heavy metals; procedure of quantitative analysis; three lectures a week with daily written exercises in balancing equations. The laboratory work will deal with practical qualitative analysis. Twelve hours a week. 3 to 6 P. M.—*H. B. Froning.*
25. BIOLOGY I. In this course the student will study in the laboratory type forms ranging among animals from the amœba to the insects and among plants from the unicellular forms to the mosses. As far as possible such types will be selected as have been found suitable for work in Biology in secondary schools. The lectures will be based upon the laboratory work. The course will consist of one lecture and two laboratory hours per day and is open to students beginning the work in Biology.
26. BIOLOGY II. In this course the number of hours and general plan of the work will be the same as for course I. The types for study will be selected among the animals from the mollusks and the vertebrates and among the plants from the ferns and the seed plants. This course is open to those who completed the course given last year or who have had the equivalent of Course I. 3 to 6 P. M., daily.—*J. B. Parker and James A. Geary.*

Languages

27. ENGLISH I. RHETORIC IN THEORY AND PRACTICE. The principles of rhetoric and the forms of discourse; the fundamentals of English Prose Composition; frequent practice in theme writing, illustrating narration, description,

exposition, and argumentation; private criticism and correction. 11 A. M. daily.—*Sarah Devlin.*

28. ENGLISH II. HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. STUDY OF SELECTED WORKS. (*a*) Outline History of English Literature from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century. (*b*) Study of the following works: (1) Pope: Satires and Epistles. (2) Shelley: Prometheus Unbound. (3) Macaulay: Essay on Addison. 11 A. M. daily.—*Francis J. Hemelt.*
29. ENGLISH III. ADVANCED ENGLISH PROSE COMPOSITION. The Technique of English Style; frequent practice in the writing of the Essay and the Short Story; private criticism and correction. 12 noon daily.—*Francis J. Hemelt.*
30. ENGLISH IV. HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. STUDY OF SELECTED WORKS. (*a*) Outline History of English Literature from the Seventh to the Seventeenth Century. (*b*) Study of the following works: (1) Chaucer: Prologue to the Canterbury Tales. (2) Sidney: Defence of Poesie. (3) Shakespeare: Macbeth. 10 A. M. daily.—*Patrick J. Lennox.*
31. ENGLISH V. HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. Intensive study of the Elizabethan and Jacobean Period, with Comparative Literature. 11 A. M. daily.—*Patrick J. Lennox.*
32. ENGLISH VI. HISTORY OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. Intensive study of the Pre-Shakespearean English Drama, with Comparative Literature, and the Technique of the Drama. 12 noon daily.—*Sigourney W. P. Fay.*
33. LATIN I. For beginners. Pearson's "The Essentials of Latin." 3 P. M. daily.—*James J. O'Connor.*
34. LATIN II. Caesar's Gallic War—Interpretation. Three hours per week. Historical outline of Latin literature, two hours per week. 4 P. M. daily .—*James J. O'Connor.*
35. LATIN III. Cicero's *Orations Against Catiline* or Essay on Old Age. Two hours per week. Versification with applications to Vergil, Ovid and Horace. One hour per week. Outline of the syntax of the noun. One hour per week. Prose composition based on Bradley's *Arnold's Latin Prose Composition.* One hour per week. 3 P. M. daily.—*Herbert F. Wright.*
36. LATIN IV. Livy's Orations—Analysis and interpretation. 4 P. M. daily.—*Herbert F. Wright.*
37. LATIN V. *Cicero* "Pro Lege Manilia": analysis and interpretation. *Latin Composition* based on "Pro Lege Manilia." *Virgil* "Georgics" extracts from II and IV. *Grammar: Syntax of Nouns and Pronouns.* Information on Text-Books and Methods. *History of Latin Literature.* I. General Outline. II. Special study of Principal Writers. 12 noon daily.—*B. Marcetteau.*
38. GREEK I. For beginners. 8 A. M. daily.—*George W. Hoey.*

39. Greek II. Advanced; matter will be arranged to meet needs of pupils. 9 A. M. daily.—*George W. Hoey.*
40. Greek III. Literature. 11 A. M. daily.—*George W. Hoey.*
41. German I. For beginners. 9 A. M. daily.—*Paul Gleis.*
42. German II. Advanced course; matter will be arranged to meet students' needs. 10 A. M. daily.—*Paul Gleis.*
43. French I. French sounds; elements of grammar; drill in verbs; translation of French into English and of English into French. 11 A. M. daily.—*Xavier Teillard.*
44. French II. Study of Idioms; reading of classical and modern writers; composition; conversation. 12 noon daily. —*Xavier Teillard.*
45. Spanish Language. Orthography and syntax combined; grammar; reading; translations: dialogues and their analysis; selections from *Don Quixote* with analysis; conversation; instructions for private study. 10 A. M. daily.—*Charles W. Currier.*
46. Spanish Literature. Origin of Romance languages; the Troubadours and Troveres; dialects of the Spanish peninsula; dawn of Castilian literature; secondary epoch of Spanish poetry with the original meters; the Cid ballads; the Dance of Death and other songs; the miracle plays and the early Spanish drama; romances of Chivalry; history of the 14th and 15th centuries; the romance, Juan Boscam, Garcilaso de la Vega; the Italian meter, the sonnet; Diego Hurtado de Mendoza; history of the 16th century; the great literary triumvirate; Cervantes; prose in the 16th and 17th centuries; Lopez de Vega; Calderon de la Barca; the mystics in prose and poetry; dramatic school of Cervantes; other eminent dramatists; poets of note in both hemispheres; the Araucana; the decline of literature in the 17th and 18th centuries; prose writers in Spain in the 19th century; poetry in the 19th century; changes in language and literature since the 17th century; general review of the history of Spanish literature. 11 A. M. daily.—*Charles W. Currier.*

History

47. Church History. The modern period of the history of the Church will be considered. Special attention will be paid to the causes and results of such important movements as the Reformation and the French Revolution, the work and influence of the Council of Trent and the success of the counter-reformation. The problems which confront the teacher in the teaching of Church History will be discussed. 3 P. M. daily.—*Nicholas A. Weber.*
48. General History. This course will consider the period extending from 1273 to 1517. It will not be confined to the

general presentation of the civil history of the various states, but will devote special attention to the great intellectual movement of the time and state its influence on the eventful history of the subsequent period. Frequent occasion will present itself to discuss the methods of historical instruction. 4 P. M. daily.—*Nicholas A. Weber.*

49. AMERICAN POLITICAL HISTORY. This course includes a brief synopsis of the progress of geographical science from the era of the Phœnicians to the discovery of America. The exploration and settlement of the New World is treated more fully. A careful examination is made of the development of England's North American colonies. An account of the principal events of the era of American independence will complete the course. 11 A. M. daily.—*Charles H. McCarthy.*

50. AMERICAN CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY. The purpose of these lectures is to enable the student to read with profit the treatises on political science and constitutional law. In fact, they give a sufficient outline of the elements of both sciences and simplify very much the teaching of civil government. The course will be similar to that given during the summer of 1911. 12 noon daily.—*Charles H. McCarthy.*

Art

51. FREEHAND DRAWING. Drawing of simple geometrical solids and casts from the antique; the representation of form in line, light and shade; the composition of simple masses and linear perspective. 8 A. M. daily.—*Frederick V. Murphy.*

52. DECORATIVE ART. The study of Historic Ornament and the theory and use of color as a medium of expression, supplemented by exercises in out-door sketching. 9 A. M. daily.—*Frederick V. Murphy.*

53. MECHANICAL DRAWING. Use of instruments; line shading; problems in geometrical drawing—orthographic and isometric projection; sketching and lettering. 3 P. M. daily.—*Fred K. Merriman.*

Music

54. MUSIC I. Harmony, counterpoint, musical composition. 8 A. M. daily.—*A. L. Gabert.*

55. MUSIC II. Gregorian Chant—History, theory, practice, accompaniment. 11 A. M. daily.—*A. L. Gabert.*

56. MUSIC III. METHOD. The relation of school music to the public in general; the purpose of teaching music in schools; the treatment of monotones; the major scale, with studies and songs in step-wise progressions; the extended scale;

skips, the tonic, sub-dominant and dominant chords; rhythm in undivided beats; wider skips as found in the inversion of the chords; sharps approached step-wise from above; flats approached step-wise from below; the evenly divided beat; two-voice music; the assignment of parts; the unevenly divided beat; accidentals by skips; four sounds to the beat; three-voice music; the assignment of parts, etc. 5 P. M. daily.—*Samuel W. Cole.*

56*a*. MUSIC IV. SIGHT SINGING AND RECOGNITION OF PITCH. 4 P. M. daily.—*Samuel W. Cole.*

Library Science

57. Study of standard works of reference, bibliography, principal schemes of classification, codes of cataloguing rules, various forms of cataloguing, charging systems, accession methods, book buying, book binding, indexing, library organization. This course will include the following five lectures of general interest, on dates to be announced later:
    1. History of Printing.
    2. Bibliography.
    3. Standard works of reference.
    4. Copyright law in the United States, International copyright law.
    5. Organization of library.

    10 A. M. daily.—*Joseph Schneider.*

SCHEDULE OF COURSES

A. M.		
8	2	Primary Methods.....*Shields*
	3	Catholic School Administration.....*McCormick*
	9	History of Philosophy.....*Turner*
	38	Greek I.....*Hoey*
	51	Freehand Drawing.....*Murphy*
	54	Music I.....*Gabert*
9	1	Philosophy of Education.....*Shields*
	4	History of Education.....*McCormick*
	17	Geometry I.....*Doolittle*
	39	Greek II.....*Hoey*
	41	German I.....*Gleis*
	52	Decorative Art.....*Murphy*

A. M.

10	6	Genetic Psychology	*Pace*
	10	Logic I	*Turner*
	12	Ethics	*Fox*
	15	Algebra	*Connor*
	16	Advanced Algebra	*Landry*
	30	English IV	*Lennox*
	42	German II	*Gleis*
	45	Spanish I	*Currier*
11	18	Geometry II	*Connor*
	19	Trigonometry	*Doolittle*
	20	Analytic Geometry	*Landry*
	27	English I	*Devlin*
	28	English II	*Hemelt*
	31	English V	*Lennox*
	40	Greek III	*Hoey*
	43	French I	*Teillard*
	46	Spanish II	*Currier*
	49	American Political History	*McCarthy*
	55	Music II	*Gabert*
12	5	Methods of Teaching Religion	*Pace*
	11	Logic II	*Fox*
	29	English III	*Hemelt*
	32	English VI	*Fay*
	37	Latin V	*Marcetteau*
	44	French II	*Teillard*
	50	American Constitutional History	*McCarthy*

P. M.

3	7	General Psychology	*Dubray*
	21	Physics I	*Crook*
		Physics (Laboratory)	
	23	Chemistry I	*Wagner*
	24	Chemistry II	*Froning*
	25	Biology I	*Parker*
		Biology (Laboratory)	
	33	Latin I	*O'Connor*
	35	Latin III	*Wright*
	47	Church History	*Weber*
	53	Mechanical Drawing	*Merriman*

P. M.		
4	8	Introduction to Philosophy.....*Moore*
	14	Political Economy.....*O'Hara*
		Physics (Laboratory)
		Chemistry (Laboratory)
		Biology (Laboratory)
	34	Latin II.....*O'Connor*
	36	Latin IV.....*Wright*
	48	General History.....*Weber*
	56*a*	Music IV.....*Cole*
5	13	Sociology .....*Lyons*
	22	Physics II.....*Crook*
		Physics (Laboratory)
		Chemistry (Laboratory)
	26	Biology II.....*Parker*
		Biology (Laboratory)
	56	Music III.....*Cole*
	57	Library Science.....*Schneider*
	6*a*	Psychology of Education.....*McVay*

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Visit of Cardinal Farley. On March 27, His Eminence, Cardinal Farley of New York, Chairman of the Visiting Committee of the Board of Trustees of the University, paid his first visit to the University since his elevation to the Cardinalate. He was formally welcomed by Rt. Rev. Rector of the University at a dinner given in his honor. In his address, the Rector paid a notable tribute to the Cardinal as an educator and patron of learning, recounting his labors in behalf of Catholic schools in the archdiocese of New York and in behalf of the Catholic University on whose Board of Trustees he has served from the beginning. In his response Cardinal Farley expressed his great pleasure in witnessing the days of prosperity of the University, and pledged his continued interest in its welfare. After the dinner a reception was held at which the Presidents of the affiliated colleges and the members of the University faculties were presented to the Cardinal.

Knights of Columbus Fund. At the meeting of the national Board of Directors of the Knights of Columbus held in Washington, D. C., on April 2, it was announced that the Catholic University fund had reached the sum of $385,000 and that the remaining $115,000, necessary to complete the endowment, would be collected before the end of the year. This endowment which the order is endeavoring to establish will provide for the board and tuition of fifty students at the University.

Extension of School Year. At the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees the school-year was extended to thirty-two and a half weeks by adding one week at the beginning and one at the end of each year.

Gibbons Hall. The Trustees also authorized the completion of Gibbons Hall, at a total cost of $240,000. The Hall

will be ready for occupancy by October 1, and will accommodate 130 students. The basement of the East wing will contain a costly chapel capable of seating 250.

Summer School. The prospectus of the Summer School has just been issued. It offers 70 courses in professional and academic subjects, and will employ 36 professors and instructors.

Athletics. The baseball season is now in full swing, and as the subjoined list of games shows, it has been an unusually successful one for the University team.

March 23, Baltimore Polytechnic 1, Cath. Univ. 7; March 25, Swarthmore 2, Cath. Univ. 3; March 26, Swarthmore 6, Cath. Univ. 3; March 30, Johns Hopkins 2, Cath. Univ. 18; April 2, Holy Cross 2, Cath. Univ. 4; April 6, Univ. of Vermont 8, Cath. Univ. 1; April 8, Amherst 0, Cath. Univ. 5; April 9, Trinity College (Conn.) 6, Cath. Univ. 12; April 10, William and Mary 2, Cath. Univ. 15; April 13, Maryland Agricultural College 3, Cath. Univ. 9; April 15, Harvard 15, Cath. Univ. 1; April 19, Washington and Lee 2, Cath. Univ. 1; April 20, Va. Military Academy 0, Cath. Univ. 3; April 22, Villanova College 0, Cath. Univ. 12; April 24, A. and M. of North Carolina 2, Cath. Univ. 1; April 27, Gallaudet 2, Cath. Univ. 8; May 4, Trinity College (N. C.) 1; Cath. Univ. 23; May 14, Villanova College 5, Cath. Univ. 8; May 16, Notre Dame 2, Cath. Univ. 8; May 18, Navy 0, Cath. Univ. 1.